

€ 1158

THE SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY

THE
SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY.



Holy Family.

EDINBURGH:
THE EDINBURGH PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.
SHAKESPEARE SQUARE.

A
BIOGRAPHY

OF THE

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT

WITH AN

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF SACRED BIOGRAPHY.

ILLUSTRATED WITH

ENGRAVINGS IN OUTLINE AFTER THE OLD MASTERS.

EDINBURGH:

THE EDINBURGH PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY.

GLASGOW: J. SMITH & SON; W. COLLINS; AND M. OGLE & SON.

ABERDEEN: BROWN & CO., AND LEWIS SMITH.

LONDON: SMITH, ELDER, & CO.

M.DCCC.XXXIX.

Succession of the Jewish High Priests, from Aaron to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, completes the Work. The Illustrations constitute a series of Engravings in outline after the old Masters, such as Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci, &c.

The want of a complete Biography of the Scriptures, such as this, has long been felt by all who have made the Sacred Writings the object of their study, and it is almost unnecessary to intimate to the reader that the materials for the compilation of a suitable work are scattered over a wide field of historical and traditionary lore. In fact, an interesting work could be written from the Rabbinical and other Oriental traditions alone, and a few of these are introduced in the present Work, to show the reader what has been, and what still is, thought in the East of Abraham, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Solomon, Ezra, Esther, and others.

Although it scarcely came within the plan of this Publication, the most prominent personages mentioned in the Apocryphal Books are not omitted. The lives of the Maccabees and others are given, because the histories of those distinguished individuals, though not sanctioned by Inspiration, form a connecting link between the close of the canon of the Old Testament and the commencement of the New.

This Work, it is hoped, will be found an excellent library book, as well as an useful family manual. The *personal life* or *history* of the subjects of Sacred History is here given at length, and many particulars concerning them from various sources, where these were not at variance with the Inspired Historians. The sources from which these accounts were taken are always intimated, and are noticed at the end of each article, that they may not interfere with the authorised and authentic narrative.

In a word, the present Volume will be found a suitable companion to the **SCRIPTURE GAZETTEER**, and both contain a mass of historical, geographical, and theological Oriental literature, which has seldom, if ever, been brought before the reader in such a com-

pass, and at such a moderate price. It will be at once seen that the collection of Inspired Writings which form the Scriptural Canon are the most important ever given to the world, whether they are considered in a historical, geographical, or theological view—that they are truly the Oracles of God, and are admirably adapted, as St Paul comprehensively characterizes them, for “doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness.”

ON THE

IMPORTANCE AND ADVANTAGE

OF THE

STUDY OF SACRED BIOGRAPHY.

Importance of the subject.—Scripture history and the revelation of the truth, given chiefly in biographical narrative.—All the individual agents under the direction of God.—Variety of Scripture characters, and different from those of civil history.—Their real character made known, and the springs of their actions set before us.—In their lives we have a view of the principles of God's moral government of the world.—The wide extent of the field comprehended.—The diversified circumstances in which human nature is represented.—Gradual progress of man to perfection, and the development of the Divine plans.—The true character of that perfection exhibited not in theory, but in practice.—Examples of this perfection adapted to all characters, but pointing upward to infinite excellence.—Analogy between the material works of God, and the manner in which he has revealed his truth.—Human compilation and collection of such lives necessary and useful.—Various sources to be consulted independently of the sacred record.—Conclusion.

I. HISTORY, in the widest acceptance of the word, is reasonably considered as the great register of the events of the world, the living light of truth, the instructor and guide of the human race. Had man been left to grope his way to truth and knowledge, in all their departments, by the exercise of his own observation and experience, in each succeeding age of the world, we can easily conceive how limited his progress must necessarily have been, how imperfect and uncertain his conquests in the boundless fields of knowledge, how conjectural and ill-founded, and ill-defined, all those principles which he must have assumed as religious and moral truth. "To be ignorant of what happened before we were born," says Cicero, "is to be always children," and what is true of the individual is applicable to the whole race. We have every reason to believe that the progress of mankind in knowledge and perfection is designed, even in this world, to be unbounded, as his talents and men-

tal powers are capable of indefinite improvement, and the region of glorious discovery, over which his Creator has permitted and encouraged him to range, is boundless as the extent of his own visible and material creation, as it recedes from the solid earth on which man treads up through the azure depths of the sky, toward the throne of the Eternal, in the inconceivable glories of invisible infinitude, boundless as the still more mysterious spiritual kingdom, and the yet undiscovered, or dimly discovered, tracts of mind. The great Newton, who carried the banners of successful and triumphant discovery farther into the undiscovered kingdom of creation than any of the other sons of science, confessed that "all he had done was only to pick up a few bright pebbles and shells on the shore of the boundless ocean of truth." That process of discovery will be carried on unchecked and unrestrained, and probably with accelerated rapidity and more confident certainty. We grow wiser by the wisdom of our ancestors; what to them was the result of protracted study and patient research proves to us a matter of ascertained knowledge and easy acquisition. Schoolboys now know and demonstrate, with the utmost facility, what baffled the science of the profoundest philosophers of former ages, and high truths unknown to them, even in conjecture, have become almost first principles, from which the disciple of modern days starts upon the career of new discovery—with the aid of which, as easily managed instruments, he compels the inert or reluctant elements to reveal their hidden treasures at the magic voice of that knowledge, which is the true and substantial power of man as an intellectual being.

Without the faithful record of history this could never have been. To know what man would have been when destitute of the accumulated knowledge and experience of the many ages of the world's existence, we have only to look what he is in savage life in the islands of the Southern Ocean, in the deserts of Africa, or in the forests and plains of America. The farthest stretch back of his memory into past events is only through the revolution of a few hundred moons; all beyond is fabulous tradition, and tales of wonder. Confined to one narrow locality, he is almost as ignorant of the world in which he lives, and of the mighty events which have passed on its busy stage, beyond the contracted circle of his own journeyings, and before the uncertain records of his own memory, as the irrational and irresponsible creatures around him. One age after another has passed away since the dawn of time, and while the wisdom of the wise, such as it was, and the knowledge of the experienced died with them and was forgot, the generations which succeeded neither made nor could make any progress, while they continued to start for themselves from the principles of a science which was always infantile and rude. It has been the fault and the folly of mankind as a race, as well as the misfortune of such barbarous tribes, that knowledge has never unrolled to their minds her ample page stored with the revelations and re-

corded experience of the past. God watched over the fate of man from the beginning, with all the vigilant affection of a kind parent, and from his invisible throne in the heavens, sent message after message to warn them against the danger of going astray from him, or rebelling against him,—to remind them of the truths which he had at first revealed,—to add to those truths continually, and to direct the minds of men onward to higher degrees and nobler perfection in the plan of his moral government, as it was to be exhibited in the accomplished economy of grace. For four thousand years the voice of God was heard upon the face of the earth, his hand was stretched out in judgment or in mercy, to punish, or protect, and reward, and his legislative throne was established among men, for the purpose of making them stand in awe of him, to love and obey him. And lest the monumental pillar should moulder into dust, and the engraving upon stone and brass should vanish under the effacing touch of time, and the hieroglyphic symbol cease to be understood, God himself inspired holy men in each succeeding age to record the history of mankind from the time of their creation, and the account of his dealings with them. It is in this history alone that we can find truth unmingled with error, certainty instead of vague conjecture and baseless hope—the undoubted cause of every effect and event which are related. It is in this book alone that we find the characters of men drawn in their real colours, and the infallible moral standard of heaven put into our hands by which to test the merit or demerit of human actions. Material nature, in all the wide extent of her varied regions, and the inexhaustible treasures of knowledge which the acute intellect and patient research of man can draw from her heights and depths, has no articulate voice to utter right moral and religious truths—to point the steps of the wanderer to the home of his desired rest—to reveal the true character of God as a Being of justice and mercy, and the true character of man, as a being who has rebelled against the laws of his Creator, and has become hateful to him, but who is yet the object of his boundless compassion and love, whom he has redeemed and pardoned—whom he has adopted as his favoured son, and through whom he has shown to the principalities and powers of heaven the “ manifold wisdom ” of his government, and the true holiness of his nature. Too often the ardent searcher after truth in the vast fields of creation has come to the melancholy conclusion, that reason and intellect, in their highest and widest flights, cannot pierce the mysterious veil which separates the visible from the invisible, the material from the spiritual—that, beautiful and glorious though the material universe may be, there is a thick gloom of spiritual darkness which broods over it, through which the intelligent spirit of man, by its own unaided powers, cannot grope or struggle into light and hope in the presence of its Creator and God,—

And star-eyed science oft has wandered there,
To waft us home the message of despair.

But other revelations than those of science and worldly philosophy have poured light upon this all-important question,—other guides than the philosophy of the heathen sage, and the demonstrations of the man of strict science, have led the anxious spirit and doubtful hopes of man to truths as certain, and to confidence as well founded, as if they had rested on the assurance of sight and sense, and been proved by the unfailing process of a mathematical deduction—

*The prophet's mantle, ere his flight began,
Dropt on the world—a sacred gift to man.*

And through the inspired history of our race, from Adam, who was the son of God, to Him who was both the Son of God and the Son of man, we can travel on the spiritual path of truth with unhesitating confidence that we are walking in the brightest light of celestial wisdom, that we are breathing the airs of the paradise of God, and living on the fruits of the tree of knowledge and the tree of life, which are here showered down in unmeasured bounty on all who choose to partake, and are calculated to train on to unlimited excellence and perfection of character.

II. These remarks may seem to be applicable to the study of revealed truth in general, rather than to the subject of the present Essay. But when it is considered that God has communicated his will for the salvation of man, chiefly in the form of narrative, and that narrative connected principally with the movements and events in the lives of individuals, it will be seen that there is no departure from the object in view. From the fall of Adam till the time when Moses was commissioned to be the Prophet and Lawgiver of the chosen people, the whole history of the world, and of God's dealings with mankind, is given in connection with the lives of those preachers of righteousness, or teachers by precept and example of the revealed truth of heaven. Human curiosity may induce us to wish that what is called a philosophical history of the antediluvian world had been given, detailing the counsels and designs of those Atheist and blood-stained conquerors and polluters of the earth, and tracing such fearful effects of the wickedness of men to their immediate and remoter causes. We might be anxious to learn the policy of Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord, the motives which induced him to found an Atheist dynasty similar to those which had been swept from the face of the earth by the waters of the flood, and the means which he made use of to succeed in his impious attempt. Such a history would have been read with deep interest by the student of the political changes of this world. But such narratives, though they form the chief topic of the profane or civil historian, who delights in detailing the gorgeous parade of war, the heroic deeds of remorseless conquerors, and the dark po-

licy of unprincipled men, occupy a very small portion of the sacred history of the truth. The history of nations, from the time of the ambitious founder of Nineveh and Babylon, to that of the last great military monarch who overawed the world with the "gloom of his glory," and desolated Europe from side to side, is nothing but a narrative of the follies, of the crimes, of the consequent suffering and misery of mankind. Now, though the history of the Bible is, in one sense, given to prove the universal depravity and corruption of the descendants of Adam, because such a proof was necessary to show the faithfulness of God to the unchangeable rectitude of his law, yet the far more important object of it is to give, through its various progressive stages, the history of that divine plan which the wisdom of God devised as the remedy for that fatal and universal corruption. No narrative so humiliating to the pride of man can we read as that given by the pen of inspired truth. "God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." This declaration of the Searcher of hearts "forms the funeral dirge of the antediluvians, and the mournful birth-song of their posterity. The waters of the flood could wash away the corrupt, but could not remove corruption; they could cleanse the earth, but not the heart of man. God smelled a savour of rest from the earth, but he never found a place of rest worthy of his purity in any heart, till he found it in the First-born of the new creation."* Of God's dealings by terrible judgments in the way of immediate interference, or by means of human agents, to punish or restrain that wickedness, we have occasionally particular accounts, but of the lives and doings of the actors in those scenes of blood and pollution we have little or nothing recorded. While the founders of empires and of mighty cities, whose impregnable walls and threatening towers bade open defiance to the God of heaven, were acquiring, as they thought, a deathless name, and a fame that would be glorious while the world lasted, they might well look with contempt or pity on the humble Chaldean shepherd, who wandered from the distant east to the land of the stranger, and pitched his tent, by the haughty sufferance of the people, on the uninhabited mountains or valleys of the land of Canaan, where he could not call the ground on which he stood his own. But the sacred historian passes by the ambitious schemes and warlike deeds of these powerful monarchs and gigantic conquerors, and gives in full detail the simple annals of the patriarch shepherd, the father of the faithful, and his as humble and peaceful sons. The history of the mighty and civilized kingdom of Egypt is given only in connection with that of the ministry of Joseph and Moses, the one a prisoner and a slave, and the other an unknown foundling of a degraded and enslaved tribe. So it is with the rest of the histori-

* The Use of Sacred History, by Dr Jamieson, Vol. I. p. 177.

cal parts of the Old and New Testaments—the events related are all connected more or less with single individuals. In a word, the history of God's providential dealings with mankind, from the beginning of time till the close of the sacred record, and onward through the dimly penetrated vista of the prophetic future, adheres, age after age, to one or more persons who bear more or less important parts in advancing the plan, which throughout we see to be in the hands of Him, all whose counsels we know to be infallible, and all whose decrees shall stand and be accomplished.

III. This, then, is one interesting and instructive feature in the Study of Sacred Biography, that all of whom the Scriptures record the lives were immediate agents in the hands of God in accomplishing his purposes of mercy and judgment to mankind. It is true, indeed, that all his creatures, from the highest to the lowest—from the most rebellious, who by pride fell from their estate of glory and happiness, and who still take delight only in thwarting His will, to the most obedient, whose sole pleasure is in making their wills accord and acquiesce with His—are all made to advance the eternal and unchangeable purposes of the Supreme Ruler. But in no other history than that of the Bible do we see this brought to pass, and the actions of the intelligent creature made to subserve the end designed and predicted by God. Every other civil history is a chaos where anarchy seems to preside, and blind chance to be the arbiter,

And tumult and confusion all embroiled,
And discord with a thousand various mot

This irreconcilable discord in history, written by uninspired authors, originates indeed alone in the partial or mistaken views of those who write with ignorance of the real nature of the subject, and of the characters of which they treat, or with prejudices which necessarily warp or overcloud their judgment. Were the history of modern events, and the lives of modern characters, written out by the unerring inspiration of omniscience, we should see that now as always the government of the world is in the hands of the same infinite Being who makes the wrath of men to praise him, and compels everything to work together in unjarring harmony to the accomplishment of the counsels of his own eternal will. In the biographies of the Bible, which are taken from the council records of heaven, we are made to see this harmonious tendency and direct and united co-operation from the commencement to the end. Throughout the whole of the diversified characters and events that are made to pass in review before us, whatever be their own clear or partial knowledge of the object which they are appointed to serve throughout the varied history of four thousand years, there is one spirit of unity which pervades and harmonizes the whole, and though it speaks often in terror, and

rebuke, and dismay to the rebellious and the guilty, yet its sole object is peace on earth and good will to man,

Sweet as that hallowed anthem, sent to hail
Bethlehem Shepherds in the lonely vale,
While Jordan hushed his waves, and midnight still
Watched on the holy towers of Zion hill.

It is no doubt true, that, in the general history of nations, individuals are raised up by God, and obviously sustained and directed by his Spirit, to rescue their countrymen from the galling thralldom of temporal or spiritual despotism. He would be a bold sceptic who doubted that "the patriot Tell, the Bruce of Bannockburn," fought in the cause of liberty and of heaven, as well as he who should hesitate to believe that the great reformer of Germany, who laughed at the impotent thunders of the Vatican, and shook the throne of the triple-crowned tyrant to its foundation, or Knox, who braved the anger of kings, and feared not the face of clay, when boldly denouncing error and proclaiming truth, were honoured instruments in the hands of God to advance his cause in the world. No one can read the lives of such men as these without feeling his heart beat with the ardour of a purer patriotism, and his attachment to the cause of truth glow with a new devotedness of enthusiasm. Yet the lives of these benefactors of the human race have been written only by men fallible and sinful like themselves, and their character and doings estimated through the medium of many prejudices. Such is not the case, however, with the lives which have been written for our instruction in the Sacred Biography of the Scriptures. Their character and all their actions are weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, and the stamp of unchangeable truth guides us to the right improvement which we are to make of them. This arises from the circumstance that they were not only raised up by God for the accomplishment of his purposes, and were under his immediate guidance in the execution of these, but also because the narrative of their faithful and zealous, or negligent and remiss execution of their duty, is recorded by Him who gave them their high commission, and who could not err in pointing out where they did the duty of faithful, or conducted themselves as careless servants.

IV. In glancing over the long list of the names of those who are famed among men, or who have thus been fellow-workers with God, we cannot but see that some are appointed to act much more important and conspicuous parts than others. The characters of these men deserve our especial study in all their actions, and in the bearing of these for good or ill on the character of their countrymen, and those around them. The songs of Homer tended to form the high imaginative character of the Greek language, and infused a spirit of patriotic enthusiasm into the minds of the nations who

read and admired that lofty poetry. The philosophy of Bacon and Newton, the divine poetry of Milton, not only remain as permanent monuments of the transcendent genius of these great men, and breathe into the breasts of those who read them some portion of their own sublime spirit, but diffuse and propagate themselves as a permanently creating and elevating principle in the national language and the national mind. So it was with many of the men whose lives are recorded for the benefit of all ages in the volume of inspiration. But it is with a stronger and a holier power that their lives and their example breathe their salutary influence over the men of all succeeding time. It is not simply because they were great men, distinguished and revered in their day for their moral goodness, or for patriotic services, or deeds of heroic daring, or legislative wisdom, or for high fame in sage philosophy or poetic genius. It is because the stamp of heaven's approval is set to their character—because they contended with the vices and crimes of a guilty world—lived separate from the society of the wicked, and untouched and unstained by their example—because in adversity they never murmured against the dispensations of the Supreme Disposer of their lot, but patiently and cheerfully acquiesced in his will—because they walked with God, and were faithful servants in accomplishing all his purposes, or, in the strong language of Scripture, “were men according to God's own heart”—men who delighted to withdraw from the busy scene of the world, and meditate on his character and laws, to study his will, and conform their heart and conduct to that, and to raise their thoughts to heaven, not as a formal and compulsory service, or the drudgery of a mechanical compliance with enjoined commands, but because they delighted in such employment for its own sake, and felt their supreme happiness when they could thus hold immediate and holy intercourse with their Father and their God. It is such traits of character as these, which to the Christian give an incalculable value and importance to the lives and example of the saints of old. They stand forth as beacons of bright and undying light, placed here and there in the dark night of time, to guide the voyager toward the distant shores of eternity and the spiritual world with certainty and assured confidence to the haven of his desired rest. In civil history, nations which have many noble characters who have stood forth in defence of the liberties and privileges of their fellow countrymen, and when the sublime moral worth and beauty of these characters are not only admired with fond sentimentality, but felt and imitated, can never sink into degradation and prostrate slavery. Greece, Italy, England, have had many such. While the Athenians not only sheathed the sword of Harmodius and Aristogiton in myrtle wreaths, while they looked to the graves of Marathon and Thermopylæ, and the trophies of Salamis, and while the spirit and example of these men lived in the bosoms of their descendants, no tyrant could tread the soil of freedom. While the stern and self-denying patriotism

of the Fabricii and Cincinnati of Rome dwelt as a living principle in the bosoms of the hardy republicans, corruption and slavery could find no harbour there. The long line of patriot heroes and statesmen of our own country keep alive the sacred fire of liberty upon the altar of their nation's glory.

When men would do a deed of worth,
The wonder of the listening earth,
They look to these, and turn to tread,
So sanctioned, on the tyrant's head.

But with how much deeper and holier influence does the example of the saints of old dwell in the bosom of the true believer? Their reward was not a withering wreath of a few leaves—the approbation which they sought and attained was not that of the fickle and noisy crowd, changeable as the wind, and restless as the sea. Their reward was a crown of glory which fadeth not away, ever fresh as the tree of life in the paradise of God, and bright as the stars of heaven; their approbation was that of Him who alone can say with the faithfulness of unchanging truth, after they have fought the good fight, and finished their course, and kept the faith, “Well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joys of your Lord.”

V. Periods of general history, as we have said, differ immensely in the degree of interest with which they are studied, but they are interesting chiefly or solely as the great events narrated, and the great principles evolved, circulate around or depend upon one or two leading individuals. Each of these is the centre of a system, which, like the sun binding the planets in their radiant course by an invisible golden chain, moves and controls the actions of all around them. But in writing or studying general history, how difficult, or rather how impossible, is it to detect the secret motives and principles of the leading characters? These are often, we might say without exception, always hid in their own bosoms, and must be vaguely guessed at. Of course, the lessons to be derived, and the principles established, are equally vague and imperfectly demonstrated. How different is it with the history written under the immediate direction of Him by whom kings reign, and princes decree judgment! There nothing is uncertain, nothing doubtful, nothing conjectural. We are admitted into the councils of the Supreme Ruler, and learn the principles of his moral government, and listen to the dictates of infinite wisdom. The actions of Moses, of Joshua, of David, are not like those of other men, inspired by the impulses of merely human motives, or resolved upon from the calculations and principles of worldly policy. They are done in immediate obedience to the commands of God, in direct execution of his will for the accomplishment of his purposes of mercy or of judgment. Those who study their actions, therefore, have not to

search in vague and random conjecture into the principles of their conduct, the rules by which they were guided, and the objects which they had in view. The cause and the effect are set before us by Him who overrules all, and we see the omniscience of God instructing their hearts with wisdom, and leading them to conduct, establishing the principles of eternal justice, by which it is regulated.

While we read the lives of those men who were Lawgivers, or Judges, or Kings of the Israelites, it is not simply the record of their own doings, and motives, and feelings—it is not merely the history of most interesting periods of the political government of the chosen people, but it is all these as they are in immediate connection with the declared will of the Supreme Ruler of nations, under the control of his power, and the direction of his wisdom, who, we know, cannot be mistaken, nor fail in his purposes—who employs unerringly the wisest means for the accomplishment of the best ends. The light which is thus thrown upon the principles of God's general moral government of the world, is especially full and distinct in the critical and great turning points of the history of that people whom he separated from all other nations, for the purpose of preserving his truth, and the laws of his eternal righteousness among men. In the history of Adam, we learn the causes which brought sin and misery into the world, and which have rendered it a scene of apparent imperfection and hopeless disorder; but at the same time that the merited curse is pronounced upon the race who had thus forfeited their birthright of the favour of a bountiful God, we have the clear announcement of the remedy which was to be wrought out by a *victorious Sufferer*, in some future age, and which at once lets us into the great and mysterious truth, that this world is the scene on which the mighty contest between good and evil, between God and the enemy of God, is to be fought and decided, in the full accomplishment of which His infinite power and wisdom, and unchangeable holiness, the harmonious union of justice and mercy, are to be developed and demonstrated to the whole universe of his intelligent creatures, and all his ways are to be justified to man.

In the history of Noah, we learn how speedily and totally men had forgotten their Creator, how fearfully the effects of the fall were converting the world into an Aceldama of pollution, from which truth and righteousness would soon have been expelled for ever, had not God interfered in judgment, to sweep the bloody and atheistic race from its groaning surface, from which the cry of vengeance arose. In the history of Abraham, we are taught how speedily men forgot that lesson of terrible justice, and relapsed almost universally into idolatry and rebellion against God, long before the “grey-haired sires” of the ark, who had conversed with those that lived in the days of Adam, and had witnessed the destruction of the antediluvian Atheists, and could tell their idolatrous children of the causes of that flood of annihilating anger,

were gathered to the dust. In the wandering life of the patriarchs of Canaan who were protected by the ever-present arm of the Almighty, and dignified by repeated intercourse with him, and revelation from him, and an express covenant with them and all their posterity, we see the gradual but certain preparation for giving over the rest of the nations of the earth to those delusions of idolatry and crime in which they delighted. In the lives of Joseph and Moses, the history of the Egyptian captivity, and the wandering through the Wilderness, we learn the discipline of severity which was necessary to train the peculiar people to an implicit obedience to those laws of righteousness, which were now to be given in their distinct fulness from the visible throne of heaven, and uttered in the audible voice of the King of kings, and which had afterwards to be pressed home upon their conviction and practice, by the ever-present administration of the omniscient Lawgiver and Judge, who dwelt in mysterious glory between the cherubim, behind the veil of the tabernacle and temple—the earthly palace which he erected amidst them. In the life of Joshua, when willing obedience to the law of God for a time was the characteristic of the humbled and severely disciplined tribes, the banner of resistless victory marched before them, and the giant warriors of Canaan trembled behind their impregnable walls, before the shout of those who had lately dreaded to look upon their warlike array. In the history of the individual Judges, who were from time to time raised up to break the rod of the heathen oppressor, and deliver the Israelites from the tyranny and slavery which they had brought upon themselves, we see the same principles of moral government administered, in which justice and severity were mingled with mercy, for the purpose of pressing home upon the people the necessity of a firm faith in the promises of God, of a constant trust in his all-sufficient protection, of obedience to his laws, and of the practice of righteousness. Through their long line of kings, whom, in their caprice, they chose in preference to the Supreme Sovereign, who had deigned to dwell among them, and to govern them as their King and Judge, and whom he granted them at their request, the principles of his moral government are seen to be the same, and brought forth in ever-new forms of wisdom and goodness, of strict justice mixed with mercy. We see what influence over the whole people the royal representative of their invisible Sovereign has, when he walks in the way of David, the man according to God's own heart, and what sin and misery are the consequence of his following the steps of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who is never mentioned but to be branded with the dark stigma that he "made Israel to sin."

VI. The history which is given us in the Bible, then, is to a certain extent the history of the world. But it is the divine history of the human race, as under the effects of the curse which they brought upon themselves

—the operation and exhibition of the fallen and corrupted nature which they inherited ; and this is given in such a way as to show the constant and strong tendency of man to forget and go astray from God and happiness, and his continual striving with the perversity of man to ruin and sink himself more deeply and hopelessly in the woe which he sees and feels his conduct unavoidably brings upon him. And all is given through the medium of the lives and actings of those individuals whom God from time to time raised up and commissioned as his vicegerents on earth, or as his divinely inspired messengers and prophets, for the purpose of declaring his will, of revealing his truth, adapted in rising degree according to the expanding powers of the human mind, and the progress of society, of foretelling more clearly and more definitely the character and undertaking of Him to whom all prophecy more or less directly pointed. In his life and teaching, in his acting, and suffering, and death, is contained and is revealed the whole counsel and wisdom of God for the salvation of men—the whole of the mysterious plan of his moral government of the world. It is evident that, if we do not understand the nature and principles of that moral government, we cannot fully comprehend the nature of our own relation to God—we cannot understand the full bearing of that plan of Redemption and Reconciliation which he has made known to us, and presses upon our acceptance ; and without understanding the full nature and extent of these, we cannot feel the necessity of our accepting of the offer, and being reconciled to him by the only means revealed under heaven whereby man can be saved. The whole of the Old Testament history, given in the way we have described, is a demonstration to this effect which human reason could never of itself have evolved, and which, much more assuredly, human tradition would never of itself have recorded, or otherwise preserved. But all has been recorded by the infallible wisdom of God, and through that long line of inspired men who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of all truth, or who were guided and controlled in their actions to advance his purpose, or punished and cut off for acting against it, we see the mighty scheme gradually and more clearly and accurately displaying itself, as the contemporary history of the world showed that the fulness of the time was coming when such a proof was necessary, when the whole intelligent creation were groaning and travailling in pain, sinking deeper in their aimless and dark groping after the truth, more and more the willing slaves of Satan and Sin, and hopeless misery—

When Peace and Mercy, banished from the plain,
Sprung on the viewless winds to heaven again—

when even Hope, the last of the celestial visitants, according to the beautiful heathen mythology, was rapidly giving place to universal scepticism, or reckless and avowed atheism. Accordingly, we find that in all, or almost all,

the arguments which our Saviour and his Apostles use to persuade men to embrace the Gospel, they appeal to the history of God's dealing with the world in the days of old, as exhibited in the lives of the chosen people, of their legislators, and prophets, and kings. They found upon these as established and certain facts. They prove that the multifarious prophecies delivered from the beginning of time have been all fulfilled in Jesus Christ—that now the ancient law of significant rite and symbolic ceremony had received its full accomplishment—had become *effete* and antiquated—that the shadow must henceforth give place to the substance, and a new and perfect economy be superinduced, and the reign of grace and mercy take the place of that of judgment.

This divine Biography of the inspired servants of God is closed with a sketch, sometimes very particular, and at others more cursory and succinct, of the labours and sufferings of those who were chosen to publish this message of truth and mercy, and of the reception which it met with, and the effects it produced in Judea and over the world. In their attempts to persuade men to a belief in the only truth which could enlighten them, and render them happy, and in search, or pretended search, after which the sages of heathenism had been wearying their strength and their genius in vain, we see in strong colours the struggle between truth and falsehood, the graphic but fearful picture of the enmity of the carnal mind against God. Though endowed with powers which were acknowledged to be superhuman, and protected by an arm which frequently displayed its omnipotence in their behalf, and though they demonstrated the doctrines which they published by an appeal to this proof, and to the traditions and history of their country and of the world—though their doctrines were such as could alone quiet the natural fears of the heart of man, and encourage and elevate his hopes, and rest his longing desires after immortal happiness on a sure and sanctioned basis, all of them were despised or persecuted, rejected, or put to death, by those whom they were so zealous to benefit—for whose sake they exposed themselves every day to privation and danger, that they might lead them in the way that conducted to eternal truth and life.

VII. One of the most striking peculiarities of the Biography of Scripture is, that it spreads over such a wide extent of time, and embraces such an immense variety of circumstances. Take up the authentic history of any of the most distinguished nations that are now flourishing, or have flourished on the face of the earth, and what do we find? In regard to all the nations of modern Europe, the retrospect of a few centuries lands us in the fabulous region of romance, or of barbarous ignorance and idolatry. When the palmy pride of Rome was verging to its decline, the northern nations of Europe were all as ignorant of their origin and destiny as the savages who now

roam the woods and mountains of America. And how far could the Roman pride look back to the certain records of history? Those who read those records know that more than half of her boasted men of renown are the fabling creations of her flattering poets, who converted murdering robbers and ignorant and idolatrous barbarians into the gods and demigods of their superstitious adoration. The refined and highly intellectual Greeks have nothing more ancient or dignified to boast. When we look to Egypt, whose gigantic monuments still defy the destroying tread of time, we find nothing of her fame and glory but a few dimly decipherable hieroglyphics, at whose meaning the profoundest study of two thousand years has only begun to guess, and which, when it has been interpreted, embodies no important information, and teaches no useful lesson, except the very common one of the folly of human pride and human ambition. When we look to the solitary ruins and grass-covered mounds, where stood the glory of the Chaldees' excellency, the proud city of the great king, what remains of that heaven-defying empire but the shadowy phantoms of her vanished power and humbled pride? Her mighty warriors and monarchs, her sages and lawgivers, her star-gazers, and astrologers, and soothsayers, have vanished from the scene of their grandeur and pride, as if they had never been. The wisdom of all the wise men of the East has passed away from the earth like a morning dream, and with the exception of the lessons recorded of their ambition and pride in the inspired history, the voice of their experience is silent as that lonely desert, where "no Arabian ventures to pitch his tent, where no shepherd makes his fold; the wild beasts of the islands cry in her desolate houses, and the dragons in her pleasant palaces."

Like some vast flood, unbounded, fierce and strong,
His nature leads ungoverned man along;
Like mighty bulwarks made to stem that tide,
The laws are formed and placed on every side;
Where'er it breaks the bounds by these decreed,
New statutes rise, and stronger laws succeed;
More and more gentle grows the dying stream,
More and more strong the rising bulwarks seem,
Till like a miner, working sure and slow,
Luxury creeps on, and ruins all below:
The basis sinks, the ample piles decay,
The stateliest fabric shakes and falls away;
Primeval want and ignorance come on,
But freedom that exalts the savage state is gone.

Such is all, or almost all, the record that we have of those mighty dynasties and states which overshadowed or oppressed in their turn the ancient world, and a few mouldering ruins, "fragments of stone, reared by creatures of clay," are all that remain to tell us what they have been, and what they have done. Search the boasted records of the more distant East, and we land in a region of fable, in which doting folly and senseless pride assume the grotesque mask of absurd antiquity. How different is it with that historic record which

God has preserved of his moral government of the world! Through four thousand years he guides the pen of inspiration, to paint the true character of the ages as they pass onward, exhibited to our contemplation, not in the fabulous light of lying tradition, not in the false colours of prejudiced enmity, or as prejudiced and partial admiration, but in the living colours of eternal truth, in that divine estimate which can never err and can never deceive. From the moment when God finished his six days' work of this material creation, and pronounced it good, when the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy over the blessed earth, and the first of our race was in his innocence and purity, down through all the centuries of time, till the mighty Conqueror destroyed the usurping power of that Enemy who had seduced man from his obedience and happiness, and till the foundation was laid for the creation of those new heavens and that new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, the hand of God guides us with unerring certainty through all the mysterious and otherwise unintelligible steps of his Providence. All this is done by raising up an unbroken succession of men with whom He held direct communication, and whose lives and actions are recorded for our instruction in the ways and the truth of heaven. And theirs are not simply memorials of their personal doings and sufferings, of their own limited experience and fallible observations. In such men as Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Hezekiah, and St Paul, we find their personal history, mixed up with that of the world, and that seen and studied not through the dim light of human reason, but from the high watch-tower of heaven, where the true causes of this world's chances and changes are written in the council records of the Ruler of the universe. Heaven is united to earth, and time to eternity, and the otherwise inexplicable events that have taken place on the earth are seen to be not the confused jarring, like the discordant counsels of the builders of Babel, in which the scheme of the designer is marred, and his end defeated, but one mighty whole, all the multitudinous parts of which are controlled and made to work out one great object which is set before us. Such a wide extent of field no human writer ever travelled over, or could pretend to explore, without the guidance which is here afforded him by God. But with that guidance darkness becomes light, unintelligible difficulties are cleared up, and man sees the reality of his own condition, and the consistency and harmony of all the plans of the Divine Providence with the revelation of his will, which has been so clearly made known through all the ages of the world's history.

VIII. In a biographical history extending through such a long reach of ages, and such different eras of civilization, we have set before our contemplation an immense variety of characters, and all in their true colours. The proper use of history is to exhibit the human heart in all its workings, in all

its motives, its desires, and aims. It is not simply a dry detail of facts, or a splendid narrative of the tumult of war and the desolation of the ruthless conqueror; it is not the account of the dark plotting of successful politics, the waxing and waning of empires, or of terrible revolutions, that can always delight or generally instruct. All conquerors, from Nimrod to Napoleon, are very similar to each other in spirit and motive, and all politicians, from Ahi-tophel to those of our own day, teach nearly the same lesson of the vanity of human wishes, and the insatiable nature of human ambition in that field. The statesmen and warriors of history act in an assumed character. The civil historian cannot read the heart, and can seldom if ever draw his characters in their natural features,—

For history has her doubts, and every age
With sceptic queries marks the passing page;
Records of old nor later dates are clear,
Too distant those, and these are placed too near—
There time conceals the objects from our view,
Here our own passions and the writer's too.

In the Scripture narrative of the lives of individuals, and in the divine delineation of character, there is nothing of this kind. When contemplated in that mirror of truth, the mask is torn from the face of the hypocrite, and the actions of the good are eulogised and enhanced by no false and unmerited panegyric. But it is the great variety of character, and the very diversified circumstances in which we are led to contemplate human agents placed, that merit our attention. We get only a short glimpse of the history of the antediluvian world, and the state of society which then existed. But here alone we see man as he came from the hand of his Creator—

—————when in his looks divine
The image of his glorious Maker shone,
Truth, wisdom, sanctitude, severe and pure—

when the law of God was written in his heart, when all his affections were in perfect harmony with the will of God, when he obeyed the divine law, because he knew not what it was to disobey, and all his delight was in holding intercourse with God, and resembling that character of holiness and goodness which he saw with unveiled and unclouded eye. The arts of civilized life, and the institutions of society, were soon invented after the fall; but we only get a view of these so far as to show us how rapidly and almost universally the pestilence of moral corruption depraved the race, and how very few were left who feared God or regarded his will. From the flood to the sojourn in Egypt, we have a period of pastoral simplicity, in which the wants and the cares of the Patriarchs were few, and the temptations and dangers which beset them could not be very great. Yet though, in merely human estimate, these might be trifling in comparison of the warlike acts, and politics, and founding of the empires of the nations around them, the

divine history overlooks these, and with very minute particularity gives us the account of the discipline by which the fathers of the favoured tribes were instructed to know the character of the true God, to put all their trust in him, and to obey his laws. We have the effect of this grounding in the principles of true religion shown in the character and conduct of Joseph and Moses, when placed in the idolatrous and licentious court of Egypt. We have, throughout the whole history of that people, the accounts of the character and conduct of men placed in the extremes of society—in the darkest storms of adversity and the brightest sunshine of prosperity—the reasons of God's so dealing with them, and the effect that this had upon their heart and future conduct. Joseph, the fondly cherished child of his father's old age, is barbarously torn away by his brethren, but sent, in wisdom by God, away from that partial affection which might have led him to forget his liability to err through pride or weakness, and is tried in the purifying furnace of adversity before he is called from the prison to be the chief minister of Pharaoh and the deliverer of his father's house. Moses, David, and others, were humbled and disciplined in a similar manner, before they were raised to the supreme power over the Israelites. In their case, and in that of all others in the sacred writings, we have their characters, not only as kings, and warriors, and legislators, but as men, with all their infirmities and imperfections, as well as all their zeal for God and love to his service, set before us. Moses, though habitually humble, on one occasion erred through pride and presumptuous confidence in himself, and was deprived of the honour of leading the Israelites into the Land of Promise, or of entering it himself. David, in the enjoyment of uninterrupted prosperity, grievously sinned against God, and against society, and we see him brought to a sense of the aggravated sin of his conduct by punishment and chastisement as severe and terrible as the transgression which brought it upon him. In short, we have laid open for our contemplation the heart and the motives, the real principles and unvarnished actings of monarchs, in the secrecy of their palaces, of the rich and the poor, of the prophet and the priest, of the learned and the ignorant, of the ruler and the subject, of parent and children, in every different state of society, in every rank and relation of life. And all this not as the actions and motives of men are judged of, or rather guessed at, by the historian and the moralist,—weighed in the balance, not of the estimate of this world's ever-changing morality, but of the unchangeable estimate of heaven, and in relation to the eternal law and truth of God. That law and that truth are indeed unchangeable, but in this study we see the one administered under different economies, as the advancing civilization of society develops the character of man, and extends the relations of social and civil intercourse, and the other gradually unfolded as his expanding intellect prepares him for the reception and comprehension of loftier doctrines, and a more spiritual and perfect service. And

above all, we have the character of Him set before us, in whose discourses we hear the words of infinite wisdom, in whose actions we behold the express image of eternal rectitude, the living perfection of divine goodness, and mercy, and holiness. And all this is exhibited, not in the overawing and unapproachable majesty of the divine or of the angelic nature, but in the lowliness of human nature, in the common breathings of human affection, in the everyday actings of ordinary life. In all the other characters of Scripture there is to be seen much weakness, much ignorance, as well as imperfection. Those whom he chose as his followers and ministers had many prejudices, and frequently erred and sinned when they followed the guidance of their own reason, and the bent of their own inclinations. But in the character and life of Jesus Christ, as drawn by the hand of his Apostles, the malignant eye of the Sceptic or the Atheist has been able to detect no spot of moral evil, no sign of moral imperfection, no intimation of any thing approaching to human ignorance and fallibility. In all heathen, in all human history, the perfect character is not to be found. The natural and ardent longing of the heart of man after high excellence and perfection has felt it, and all ages have united in the confession that the utmost efforts of the best of men have fallen infinitely short of that moral perfection which it was acknowledged was obvious to the contemplation of the mind, and which it was fondly hoped was within reach of our attainment. The genius of poetry and romance has called to its aid the high colouring of fiction, and imaginary scenes and acts, to body forth to the mind's eye a living copy of faultless perfection. But though truth and beauty of moral excellence in all that has been done by men through all ages of the world's history have pitched their tents before the enthusiastic admirers of attainable human virtue, and though

—bright-eyed fancy hovering o'er
Scatters from her pictured urn
Thoughts that breathe, and words that burn,

it has been felt and confessed, that no such attempt has yet succeeded.

Plato thought that if Virtue were exhibited to the observation of mankind in her native and heavenly beauty, all would be captivated with her loveliness, and drawn to imitation. It was the fond thought of an ardent mind which delighted to soar into the regions of abstraction, above the grossness of the corrupt human nature which he saw around him, and to fix and realize these evanescent forms of moral perfection which sometimes reveal themselves to the happier day-dreams of fallen humanity, only to show from what a glorious height man has descended, and how unavailing are all his efforts to scale that bright summit, radiant with the eternal light of heaven, and blooming in the ever vernal atmosphere of immortality. When that divine perfection did descend on earth, when the Son of God, "the brightness of his

Father's glory, and the express image of his person," exhibited in the nature of man the fulness of the Godhead, when his lips uttered the words of truth and grace, when all his actions displayed mercy and love unbounded and unrestrained, for the purpose of raising us from the depth of degradation and misery to which we had fallen, and again elevating us to our birthright of moral perfection, and to the love and approbation of God which we had hopelessly lost, how was he received and entertained? "He was despised and rejected"—in the eyes of men he had "no form nor comeliness"—when they looked upon him they saw "no beauty that they should desire him." They saw him through the false medium of their own prejudices—they viewed his excellence with a preference of their own corruptions, and listened to the wisdom and truth of his doctrines with an overweening conceit of their own ignorance—with the conviction that their errors were demonstrated and established truths. Yet though the conduct of the world proved the sentiment of the heathen sage practically paradoxical, still it is felt to be founded in truth by all who contemplate aright the divine character expressed in the life of Jesus Christ—they feel themselves constrained to love him who so loved them, who exhibited such an union of every perfection which the imagination can conceive. And the more they contemplate it, the more nearly they are brought into contact with its regenerating power, the more do they feel that they are progressively changed from glory to glory, as by the lost image of God being restored to their souls, and formed within them as a living principle, as the life of their life, the ever-present evidence of their interest in the citizenship of heaven.

IX. Independently, therefore, of the natural curiosity which such a study is calculated to excite, and to gratify to the utmost, we have in the Biography set before us in the Bible the exhibition of the gradual progress of human nature under the guidance and instruction of the Creator and Judge of all—we have the gradual training onward and expansion of those thoughts which of themselves "wander through eternity," but which, without the constant controlling presence of God, find no home nor resting place. Reason proved itself incapable of passing the fathomless abrupt which lies between time and eternity—between the visible and invisible. It is not intended to assert that all mysteries are now plain, and that nothing remains to be revealed or discovered in the spiritual world—that the utmost extent of truth has been reached by man when he possesses the revelations which have thus been successively communicated from the dawn of time till the last word spoken by the inspired followers of Christ before they ceased from their warfare, and were called to their reward. Far from it. That revelation only opens up the endless vista of progression to spiritual knowledge and perfection, which God has set before us. But then we have in the lives and experience of the

saints of God from the beginning, a new principle brought home to our perception, and which is evidently in its exercise and application beyond the bounds of reason and intellect—we mean the principle of faith.

It is no doubt true, that most men will grant the probability of the proposition, that the Creator has it in his power to make his will known to his intelligent creatures how and when he pleases ; but it is also true in spiritual things, such as those which are the objects of our faith in the Bible, that unless the reality of this revelation, and the efficient and accepted exercise of this faith, had been made known to us by a long and uninterrupted and consistent chain of facts, a single interference and manifestation of the kind at the fall, or at any succeeding era of time, would not have been sufficient to satisfy our reason. We know by the result, at almost every successive stage, that the traditionary knowledge of the fact would have been grossly perverted, and the belief itself in the doctrine revealed would have become vague and uncertain, and been at last altogether lost. We need not substantiate this proposition by an appeal to specific facts in the history which we are considering. Throughout the whole period, and in all its stages, the people who were favoured with these communications were ever ready to fall away from the faith of the doctrines which had been so repeatedly confirmed to them by divine authority, and of the promises of future and mysterious redemption and deliverance, which formed such a prominent and striking part of the system of law and worship which had been given them in circumstances of such terrible majesty. But, seeing the principle confirmed by God to the experience and conviction of his people for such a length of ages, the exercise of faith in His revealed word, and in the reality of the invisible things of heaven, is no longer a doubtful exercise of the mind in regard to a probable contingency hereafter, which may possibly await us—it is no longer an unsanctioned hope of future happiness, which the wishes and the longings of nature strongly incline us to entertain. It becomes, when thus set before us, as the exercise of soul which God encouraged and raised higher and higher for four thousand years, what St Paul describes it to be in reality, “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”

It is only in the lives of the Scripture saints that we find the assured and proper exercise of this principle, the basis of every true act of religion. The heathen sages in all their wisdom, and in all their profound metaphysical researches into the works and the character of God, and of the destiny of man after death, had no foundation at all but dim tradition or probable conjecture upon which to elevate their desires and rest their hopes. The wisest and most practical of them all, who has been with justice styled “the apostle of natural religion,” when he reached the verge which separates the world of sense and sight from the world of spirits, confessed, with melancholy sincerity, to the judges who had just condemned him to death, “We part, you to live, and I

to die, but which destiny is preferable the gods only know." How different is this from the confident assurance of hope which the Apostle of the Gentiles, who, in after days, was derided as a babbler and introducer of new gods, by the same proud court, entertained, when in like manner he came to die by the sentence of a more painful death—"I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth I know that there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at that day." There can be no comparison between the despondent conjectures of the one and the triumphant joy of the other, just because the one groped after the truth by the light of the glimmering taper of obscured and erring reason, which of itself naturally led astray, while the other contemplated the mark for the prize of his high reward in the meridian light of the sun of eternal truth.

X. A great deal of false theology and unfounded speculation has been drawn from the doctrine of St Paul, "that the Gentiles, who have not the *revealed* law, are a law unto themselves, showing the *deeds* of the law written in their hearts," while their conscience accuses or excuses for the performance of those deeds. It is true that the Gentiles have a natural reason and conscience which have invariably told them that there is a God above who rules over them, and informs of the distinctions to a certain extent between the good and evil of conduct. But the Apostle advances the proposition for the very purpose of proving that the Gentiles were under the condemnation of that law which their reason and conscience declared was binding upon them. They did not obey it, and they knew they could not obey it sufficiently or satisfactorily to their own conviction. But they knew of no alternative, except speculating in the regions of indefinite and misty philosophy. Many of those speculations are exceedingly beautiful, and the conclusions to which they led were just and proper in themselves, in regard to the character of God and the relation in which man stands to him. This, however, was all the length they could go. They knew neither how to come before him, nor how to attain to that character which would render them acceptable in his sight. In a word, they knew neither what real goodness was, nor how it was to be obtained. Their only effort at this was to write treatises upon morals, and try to reduce these as much as possible to the principles of a science. To a certain extent they succeeded in at last working out a system. But any one who has read the speculations of the best of them knows how utterly inadequate they are to bring the perfection of morality home to the business and bosoms of men, and, of course, how utterly worthless they were as the means of regenerating and reforming society. Much the same objection lies against all the moral systems of more modern times, when men have had the advantage of the divine materials which God

has given them in his own word of truth. Yet it is perfectly well known, that lecturing upon the general truths of moral philosophy never reformed a nation. Though all the various systems which the profound intellect or inventive ingenuity of speculative men has produced may have more or less of abstract truth in them, yet, though fully understood and believed, they fail to impress—they fail to take hold of the affections, and influence the daily conduct. And even though the practical wisdom of Socrates, and the beautiful speculations of Seneca, and the proverb-manual of Epictetus, had not all been egregiously defective in pointing out what was the true perfection of human virtue, and the means of attaining it, they had no example, or set of examples, to hold up to the imitation of those whom they wished to persuade. This is done to the amplest extent in the Biography of Scripture. While the doctrines are confirmed by the demonstration of heaven, and the means of being reconciled to God are brought to the capacity of every understanding, multitudes of living examples are given to show the manner in which those doctrines were believed, the effect which they produced, and the characters which they formed. The Scripture record, as we have remarked, is eminently a book of lives, and these exhibit, in multifarious ways, the living and practical effect of the reception of the doctrines. The conduct of men is set before us in all its relations, public and private, which no general history could have done; and, with such beings as man, is calculated to produce an effect which no general enunciation of the truth, no inculcation of systems of moral precepts, could have accomplished.

This is the true and the only bringing of wisdom down from heaven to earth; this is reflecting, in innumerable ways, the communicated light of heaven, and making that light so shine before men, that they may be led to glorify their Father in heaven. We are much readier to be convinced of the danger and exceeding sinfulness of sin when we see it denounced and punished by the immediate interference of God; and we will be much more impressed with, and drawn to imitate, the conduct of those whom we witness enjoying the approbation of God, and hear Him, in regard to every act of their life which is related, pronouncing, as it were, “Well done, good and faithful servant.” We know that we are commanded to love God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, and mind, and we know that He is worthy of all the devoted ardour of our gratitude and love; but we come to know what it means more definitely and clearly, when we see David night and day pouring forth the deep breathings of gratitude, and adoration, and love. We know that we ought to be zealous in the cause of God, but we do not learn the true nature of that zeal from the boasting and selfish hypocrite Jehu—we see it in St Paul and the other Apostles spending and willing to be spent in that warfare, in opposition to all the pride, and power, and learning of the world. And above all, we see a union of every thing which we ought to ad-

mire and practise, in the character of Him "who went about continually doing good," who counted it as his "meat and drink to do the will of God."

In this respect, we have in the study which we are recommending what is not to be found in any other collection of lives of the most distinguished men, of the greatest saints, on the face of the earth. These are all written by fallible men, and we may see, or think we see, the prejudices and weaknesses, the errors and failings, of the writers, as well as of the subjects of their biography. But this we can only do with the drawback of similar prejudices and errors of our own. Nothing of this kind occurs in Scripture Biography. Every thing held forth to our contemplation there, good or bad, is measured by the standard of the sanctuary, and stamped by the unerring approval or condemnation of Him who searches the heart. It is the copy of moral perfection, therefore, set before us, not as admired by men, or drawn by their erring reason and their earthly prejudices, but such as it appears in the eye of Omniscience and infinite holiness. This expressed image of the life of the regenerate has a much more direct and certain effect upon the mind and conviction of all, both learned and unlearned, than the clearest declaration of abstract truth, and the most impressive persuasion to comply with the plainest precepts, could have separately had. Casuists will differ, and polemics will contend about the meaning and extent of these, and the true fruits of faith are withered and blighted by an angry contention in regard to its modes and expressions—

And questions nice, where doubt on doubt arose,
Awaked to war the long contending foes.
For dubious meanings learned polemics strove,
And wars on faith prevented works of love ;
The brands of discord far around were hurled,
And holy wrath inflamed a sinful world.

Such unholy contests have taken place, and will still arise, from the false zeal of proud man, as long as his perverted reason and misleading passions influence him in his conduct and speculations. Were it not for the striking and living contrast between this, and that "wisdom which is from above, which is pure and peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated," as exhibited in the examples set before us in the Bible, in the lives of those who show the genuine fruit of a living faith by the character of their obedience, such polemic bigots, would be set forth as the most perfect examples of conformity to the principles of the law of God. The Pharisees, in the time of our Saviour, by their extreme professions of superior knowledge and holy zeal for the letter of the law in its utmost strictness, according to their interpretation, utterly banished its power, and quenched its living efficiency in their breasts. They disregarded truth, mercy, and righteousness, and were in reality men whose lives were a gross contradiction to their professions, while they per-

sueded themselves and the admiring multitude to believe that they were the spotless paragons of all holiness and heavenly zeal. Such a gross perversion will often take place in the history of the church, when men allow themselves to be led away by the same spirit, and contend about the meaning of words which would be unspeakably plain if they were to contemplate them in the actions of those who dictated them, rather than through the medium of their own passions, and the jealousies of selfish rivalry.

XI. The truths of the Scriptures, then, are such as man could never of himself have discovered without the revelation of God ; such, as we have seen, his traditions could not have preserved in their purity and intelligible application to the instruction and direction of the race, as the intelligent offspring of God, had they been all revealed at first and at once. But, like all the other works of God, there is an ascending and expanding process in the plan, adapted to the growing intellect of the race, and of each individual who studies the Scripture for himself. It is this beautiful simplicity which distinguishes the system of Divine revelation from every other of human invention, and fits it to be understood by man in every stage of his progress, and renders it applicable to all states of society. Other systems partake of the character of the age and nation in which they were invented, and by which they were believed ; but that of the Bible, while, from its nature, it is perfectly comprehensible by the child and the savage, by the unlettered peasant as by the profound philosopher, stretches up to the infinite, and contains the elements of inexhaustible spiritual knowledge. All this is revealed to us in the simple way which we have been considering. The character of God is made known to us by the plain detail of the history of men ; His law is set before us by the account which he has left us of his dealings with individuals, and through them with tribes and nations, and the whole human race, from the beginning of time till the whole system was completed, and prospectively, till the history of time, and of His moral government of the world, shall come to a close. But on these few and simple facts are founded doctrines which otherwise would have been altogether beyond the comprehension and discovery of mankind. In the history of that Providence thus given we have earth reunited to heaven ; the spiritual and the material brought into direct contact and intelligible union ; and the way opened up, by which we ascend to expatiate through the irrevoluble circles of eternity.

We will not enter on the discussion of the question, Whether Moses has plainly taught the doctrine of future rewards and punishments—whether there can be any true religion without some belief in such a doctrine—whether the people of Israel were prepared to understand or to feel it ? It is plain that the whole history of Moses gives its full meaning only on the supposition that to the patriarchs the events, which were to take place long after

they were mouldering in the dust of their fathers, were to be to them matters of deep and personal interest. It is of little consequence whether they understood, or could understand, the manner in which this was to be. Even supposing they were ignorant, and that on the word and faithfulness of God they believed in his promises, and hoped with a confident anticipation of future joy, when all their experience and observation would have led them to renounce hope, to doubt, or despair,—this very process of leading their faith and their hopes gradually upward from the obscure, the doubtful, the unintelligible, till they at last rested on the only foundation on which such hopes can rest,—the declared word of eternal truth, sanctioned to the unhesitating faith of man by innumerable proofs,—is the strongest of all evidence that the work and the revelation was indeed of God. In carrying forward the system to this demonstrated perfection, and advancing the minds of his chosen nation of witnesses contemporaneously along with it, he “gave them line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little,” as they were prepared to understand and benefit by the revelation. They, as well as the rest of the world, were in the infancy of knowledge, and he educated them like little children. The various steps of that process of education in revealed truth are preserved, for our benefit, in the lives of those various teachers whom, from time to time, he sent from his invisible throne in the heavens to make known his truth on earth. •

Our space will not permit us to point out the unfolding of the whole scheme of that revelation, from the mysterious but consolatory announcement, after the fall, that “the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head,” till the voice of the triumphant Conqueror pronounced on the cross, “It is finished!” But certainly the study of that progressive advance from such a simple fact to the full perfection of the triumph of the power and wisdom of God over the dark machinations of the author of evil, and over the perverse infidelity and rebellion of that world for whose redemption and deliverance all was undertaken, is one of the most deeply interesting subjects of meditation which can occupy all the faculties, and engage all the affections, and captivate the faith of man. This study is essentially identified with that of the lives of the various agents whom God employed in this his own work. We can scarcely, even in imagination, separate their own sayings, and actings, and faith, from the work in which they were engaged,—from the great end which they might and did see obscurely, but which God foresaw, and had decreed from the beginning,—and which, under his ever-present superintendence, we see continually advancing to its certain accomplishment.

In wonderful and harmonious analogy with this system of progressive development are the various parts of the perfected and complete plan of that revelation itself. To the unaided survey of human reason, in its deepest musings on the present scene of things, this world always seemed a chaos of

inextricable confusion, where light and darkness, good and evil, carried on a doubtful and even contest, in which the Creator seemed to have been marred and defeated in his plans, and to have left it to the tyranny of evil, and the riot of rebellion, and vice, and misery. But, contemplated as we are now enabled to view it, the simplicity of the plan resolves itself into a few very plain and easily understood facts, which explain every thing mysterious, and remove every thing which can raise doubts or fears. Men rebelled, and fell from their happiness, and subjected themselves to the just punishment of a violated law ; but God interfered, and in mercy upheld them, and provided a substitute, who should at once, by obedience and suffering, maintain the inviolable authority of that law, and deliver those who had incurred its irrevocable sentence, and not only point out the way which led to heaven, but bestow all the means of attaining to its happiness.

These are the plain and easily understood principles which are at the foundation of the sublime doctrines and mysterious truths of the Christian system. Based upon these few plain and simple facts, the mind is raised to the right understanding of the character of God, which man, which even the highest intelligent creature, could not otherwise have understood. But those would imperfectly comprehend the nature of the subject, who supposed that the knowledge and belief of these comprehended the understanding of the whole system, and constituted all the perfection of wisdom and faith which are set before us in the word of God. Though we see through a glass, darkly, now—while we observe and can reach only the very elements of that perfection which is set before us as attainable, and exhibited to our contemplation in such a variety of forms and degrees through the whole history of those who have believed, and lived under its renovating and heavenly power,—we have the conviction that there are exhaustless stores of knowledge yet to be acquired even here, in the study of that revelation which is so easily intelligible, and yet in all its bearings so profoundly mysterious. What a striking analogy do we find here between the revealed truth of God, and the material works of his hands ! Though the loftiest geniuses have for the whole period of the world's existence exercised their most ardent and prolonged researches into the riches of the kingdom of nature, every age in succession makes known the fact that we are only on the outward limits of that region of knowledge which the wide volume of the universe holds out to our contemplation. Mysteries of wonderful character are yet to be made known within, and around, and above us ; and every thing that is, time after time, discovered, serves to strengthen the conviction that the progress of man toward a higher degree of knowledge and perfection is unbounded. But this has been hitherto reached by the slowest steps, and by advances from the rudest ignorance, through means of the plainest and most obvious adaptation of the elements of material nature, to our material organs. The mind has made use of these

in the most wonderful manner to carry on its own mysterious operations, and from the admirable adaptation which the Creator has established between matter and spirit in this lower world, man is enabled to raise himself above the materiality with which he is to a certain extent identified, and contemplate truth in the abstract, and expatiate with something like certainty in regions which the eye has not seen, and draw conclusions in regard to things of which no report has been brought to his ears by any explorer of the untravelled regions of space, or of the spiritual world. Now, in beautiful adaptation to this lowliness and limited range of our fallen nature, we have seen that the language of Scripture is obvious to the capacity of a child; and all the illustrations of its spiritual doctrines are drawn from the visible things, and relations of ordinary life, with which we are daily conversant, while it raises our thoughts and affections by these very means to the spiritual, and enables us to be as conversant with the invisible realities of heaven as we are with those to which we are now confined. The Spirit instructs man in that language which alone he can understand, and through the long-continued process of that instruction which we have been explaining, has not only established our faith on a foundation which cannot be shaken, but from the simplicity of its first elements to the infinitude of its yet uncomprehended and unexplored relations, has rendered it every where intelligible to man, and efficient for his salvation, while every step in advance which he takes, after that cloud of witnesses who have gone before, expands his views and elevates his desires, and enables him to contemplate with clearer evidence and more assured certainty the prospect of endless perfection which he sees displayed before him.

XII. We have seen, then, that, in the Study of Sacred Biography, we become acquainted with the history of the Divine Providence, and the principles of God's moral government, not simply as it relates to this rebellious province of his dominions, but as it extends throughout the whole of his intelligent creation,—we study the character of man, as it is in the sight of Him who alone knows the hopeless depth of human weakness, and the perverse waywardness of the human heart,—we have revealed for our instruction all that God has done through the history of time to counteract the effects of the fall, to bring mankind to a right knowledge of the relation in which he stands to Him under the law, and of the new relation in which God has condescended to stand toward mankind in the covenant of grace,—we have not only the truths of that dispensation made known to us in their simplicity, but in innumerable examples behold the manner in which those principles operate in forming the character of man to become again a holy subject of the moral government of his Creator. All this we behold, not in the contemplation of a system of abstract truth, nor in one overawing and compelling

manifestation of Deity, to the eye and understanding of his intelligent offspring, but as a grand system in operation under the direct superintendence of Omniscience, and gradually unfolding itself to our faith through a long series of ages. It stands out in strong contrast to every varying system of human folly and human philosophy—to all the false refuges of the error and superstition of the heathen world. We see it formed as a principle of hope in the hearts of the saints of old, who rested on the pledged faithfulness of God, and trusted in it as a promise of deliverance yet to be accomplished in the distant future, and in a way which they could not comprehend—and we see it operating in its full perfection at last, in the minds of those inspired men who were commissioned to publish the accomplishment of that primeval promise, and to proclaim “peace on earth, and good-will to men.” We see the seed of this tree of knowledge and of life cast into the barren and ungenial earth, and spring up at first “like a root out of a dry ground”—like a blighted shrub of the wilderness—but slowly stretching out its majestic boughs and spreading its branches till it covers the earth with the glory of its celestial foliage, and supplies the food of life to all its multitudinous tribes. Rooted on earth, it shoots up to heaven, and the eternal sunshine of the paradise of God again rests in unclouded glory upon its summit, and by partaking of its now unforbidden riches, man becomes a fit citizen of the heavenly abode, ‘an equal and companion of angels, an adopted son of God, and “joint-heir with Christ” of that kingdom which in his human nature he conquered for mankind.

XIII. But it may be said, that the lives and experience, the faith and the contests, of the saints of old are all given in the Bible in the words dictated by the Spirit of unerring wisdom, and that such a work as the present is therefore superfluous and unnecessary. The remark, to a certain extent, is true, and yet it by no means follows that human compilations, with explanations and inferences, are unnecessary or unprofitable. The same objection lies against every other human composition that treats of divine things, or undertakes to explain the doctrines and mysteries, the promises and precepts, of revelation. Every thing which God requires man to believe, every thing which he has revealed to instruct us in knowledge and righteousness, is there contained; and while the severest anathema of his displeasure is pronounced against those who presume to add any thing to his word, or take any thing from it, we are told that there are “some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction.” We are therefore enjoined to “search the Scriptures,” to “compare spiritual things with spiritual,” to perfect, by use and exercise, those talents of mind which God has given us, that we may be “able to give a reason for the hope that is in us.” For this purpose, the labours of learned and pious men have

always been considered of great and essential use. They have explained much which was difficult, thrown light upon what was obscure, reconciled those seeming inconsistencies which the enemies of truth so eagerly seize upon, with the wicked design of supplanting the faith of the Christian. In the department of the sacred history, which this volume comprehends, an immense deal has been done by the patient and long-continued researches of the learned, in explanation of manners and customs which no longer exist, the many allusions to and illustrations drawn from which would be otherwise unintelligible to the common reader. Much has been done this way in explanation of the bearing of facts incidentally alluded to, in connection with the history of individuals and nations. All these might be thoroughly well understood when the manners and habits were in existence, and before the daily observation of all,—when the facts were well remembered, or the historic records which preserved them were in the language of the day, and in the hands of all, or easily accessible. But the lapse of ages has swept away all these, and far remote antiquity has thrown the obscuring veil of oblivion over many of them. They do good service then to the cause of truth, who, by exploring those distant recesses where the scattered fragments of the wrecks of time lie in neglected and nearly forgotten obscurity, do so much to restore, as it were, the form and full expression of ancient days and manners. Some of these are found in heathen authors,—many ample and particular illustrations are found in the Jewish historians, Josephus and Apion, who wrote for other nations than their own countrymen, and of course were led to explain many customs and circumstances, which a Jew, writing for the benefit of his countrymen, would not have thought necessary—many are found in the Jewish commentators of later ages, whose writings, though filled with many absurdities, and monstrous prejudices and errors, are yet useful in showing what were their opinions of the laws, and the doctrines, and the hopes of their fathers. We find multitudes of illustrations of a similar nature in the early Fathers of the Greek and Roman Church, who, though also full of prejudices and occasional errors, have preserved many facts relating to the labours and lives of the Apostles and early teachers of the Gospel. The incessant and perilous labours of these first ministers of the word prevented them, even had they been inclined, to write lengthened memoirs of their own labours and success, of their sufferings and triumphs.

It is true that their ecclesiastical biographers, after the bloody storm of persecution blew over, and days of quietness and peace at last visited the Church, filled their accounts with many stories which are obviously contradictory, and hence fabulous, and the degenerate and superstitious successors of these men in the Church of Rome have added an inconceivable mass of superstitious absurdity, in their purely fictitious legends. But still these very facts show the natural anxiety which man has to obtain information in regard

to the manner of life and death of such individuals, and the success of those labours which, with such self-devotion, they undertook in the cause of their Divine Master, and in the cause of their ignorant persecutors. Such accounts form the connecting link between the inspired history of the Divine economy, and the human history of the Church. To give them faithfully and truly did not require the aid of inspiration, therefore that was not communicated. But still, since the abject veneration of superstitious days has mixed much of the fictitious and the absurd with the true and valuable, it becomes the duty—and it is an important and useful duty—of the writers of such a work as the present, to sift the vile from the valuable, the chaff from the wheat, and to exhibit truth without the poisonous mixture of fable. It requires no little research and judicious discrimination to accomplish this task properly, and the whole of it lies in a rather barren field, which is seldom or never trodden now, by common readers of the Bible. Yet it is manifest, if the labour is executed judiciously, its result will not only gratify natural curiosity, but convey much useful instruction and important information.

XIV. Again, throughout nearly the whole of the long period over which Sacred Biography extends, there is a connection more or less intimate between the sacred and the profane history of the world. The heathen nations all around the sacred boundaries of Palestine, with their kings and warriors, were instruments in the hands of God in accomplishing his purposes. These come frequently in transient review before us, and in the prophecies and declarations of the word of God, we see their fate closely connected with their conduct towards the chosen people. Yet frequently incidental allusions only are made to the most important of these, and the accomplishment of the denunciations of the Divine displeasure is to be found, not in the pages of the sacred narrative, but in contemporary or future historians of those or neighbouring nations. A full knowledge of the character of these enemies of God was possessed by those to whom the inspired authors addressed themselves, and therefore neither their character, nor frequently any account of their history, was given. The collecting of that together now, from the forgotten records of heathen antiquity, serves to confirm our faith in the certainty of the Divine declaration and decrees. The history of the Cyruses and Alexanders, of the Cæsars and Herods, of Pilate and Felix, and multitudes of others who are mentioned in the Bible, is intimately connected with many most important facts and allusions to them; but we are left to other resources, which are amply sufficient to afford us such information as is necessary for understanding their characters, and the references of Scripture.

Such short accounts, therefore, as can be given in a work of the limited extent of the present, are of great use to the general reader, in more fully understanding passages of very great importance, and of the deepest interest.

We learn from the Evangelists, in regard to Herod the Great, that, in his jealous fear of Him who was declared "born King of the Jews," he issued the sanguinary decree to murder all the children of Bethlehem; but in the profane history of this period, we are informed how that guilty fear punished him in the bosom of his own family, to whom he acted in the character of a jealous tyrant and relentless executioner, and who, in their turn, acted toward him as rebels and traitors, till he expired in the agonies of remorse and the despair of blasted ambition, the object of the terror and hatred of his subjects and nearest relatives. We are informed of Felix that he trembled when Paul "preached to him of temperance, righteousness, and judgment to come," and are left to learn, from the common historians of the day, the character of him in whose bosom these topics roused such terrors, as a man who was totally regardless of divine and human laws, rioting in the grossest and most shameless licentiousness, and oppressing the Jews without measure and compassion. It was not necessary that the sacred narrative should be swelled by lengthened accounts of such things as these, which, though they throw much light upon the import and application of its doctrines, are not essentially necessary to the understanding of the meaning of the doctrines themselves, and which can be gathered from other sources.

In those days, besides, when the humble Christians were objects of the unmitigated hatred and persecution of the proud Romans, it might have been imprudent, as no doubt it would have been dangerous, for them to have had recorded in their books the true and full characters of the depraved and brutal Emperors of the world, and of their fully as corrupt Deputies and Procurators in the provinces. Though Paul wrote many of his Epistles from Rome, when a prisoner there under Nero, one of the most abandoned and cruel of rulers under whom guilty and suffering mortals ever groaned, we do not find in them a single allusion to the grossness of his inhuman barbarity and almost incredible licentiousness. This was left for the historians of Rome; and no one can read the minute detail of the manners of his court, as given in the pages of Suetonius, or the more indignant portraiture of the philosophic Tacitus, without an overwhelming disgust, and a thrill of horror, at the worse than brutish depth of depravity into which man can plunge himself. But to understand fully the nature of the contest which the Apostles had to maintain, the difficulty of the undertaking of working out the regeneration of a world so sunk in hopeless ignorance, in desperate atheism, and excessive wickedness, we must know something of the manners of the men, and of the age in which they lived. It belongs, of course, to the general historian to give the full picture of that age and state of society; but in the biography of the different characters, enough can be done to throw great light upon the writings of the New Testament. The common readers of its various treatises and epistles, in the early days of Christianity, did not re-

quire such illustrations, because all allusions to the incidents, and institutions, and characters of the time, were familiar and plain to men who lived among them; but they have become essentially necessary now to those who live in a state of society altogether different. Even modern travellers, who visit the scenes where these transactions took place, where these men lived two thousand years ago, give much useful and interesting information upon things over which such a lapse of ages and such a flood of changes have passed; but when the living portraiture can be brought back from the records of contemporaries, the whole scene is revived in fresher and stronger reality to our contemplation, our ideas become more accurate, and our reasonings and conclusions more certain and satisfactory.

XV. But even in regard to those who occupy a very prominent part in the sacred history, such a work as the present is not only useful, but in many respects necessary. Even in the lives of those which are written apparently systematically, their doings are mixed up and involved with those of many others. To have a distinct and individual view of these characters, much study and learning is necessary, to separate what is extraneous, to arrange and combine all in consecutive and harmonious order. In regard to many of them, several of the sacred writers mention various facts omitted by others, and view them from different positions, and in regard to different periods of their lives. Unless all these are put together, and the whole illustrated by a knowledge of the manners of antiquity and contemporary history, we have not a full view of the character. Let us take, for example, the life of our Saviour. It was written by four different individuals, each with a separate and distinct design. By each of these many actions are related, and doctrines and sayings recorded, which have been omitted by the others. Some of them do not observe the order of events, while others do; some of them are much more particular and full, in regard to several most important events, than others: and St John especially, in recording very fully the doctrines and consolatory sayings of Christ, towards the close of his ministry, when the minds of his disciples were now more enlightened and instructed to receive and understand the full bearing of those spiritual truths. It has been always felt, that a combined and consecutive view of all these would have a stronger effect upon the mind of the reader than the detached shape in which they have been left; and in all ages, Harmonies of the Gospels have been compiled, for the purpose of giving such a life of Christ as the materials supplied by the Spirit of truth enable men to compose. In like manner, in studying the life of the Apostle Paul, it is not simply the account of parts of his labours, given in the Acts, that must be searched. There is a great variety of hints and allusions in his several Epistles, both to these, and to many other parts of his life, both before he was converted, and after the narrative

of St Luke closes, as well as during the period which it embraces, all which must be carefully compared, in order to give us a full view of his character and labours. It is by bringing these judiciously together that much mutual light is reflected between the Epistles and the history given, and by which alone we are enabled clearly to understand many of the reasonings and exhortations, the admonitions and warnings, of this great Apostle. Almost all those Epistles were written on particular emergencies; and unless we understand the circumstances of the Churches which called them forth, and the objects which he had in view, we will be often in danger of misapprehending his scope, and drawing false conclusions from his arguments. And what applies to him particularly, is more or less applicable to all the rest of the Apostles and Evangelists. They wrote and spoke in circumstances, and with allusions to prejudices, and events, and passions, which required no lengthened explanation to those who witnessed and felt them. But to us, at this distance of time, and with habits and prejudices so very different, they require particular explanation. The most proper place to do this with the fullest effect, and in the shortest space, is evidently in the personal history of the various characters which the Scripture places before us. Such a work, executed with the requisite degree of useful erudition and care, and studied with proper attention, must give great additional aid and confidence in the study of that book, which every one who believes it to be the word of eternal truth must feel it to be his duty, as well as supreme interest and delight, more and more fully to understand in all its bearings on time and eternity. The study of the sciences conversant with material things, whatever expansion and power it may give to the intellect of man, can nevertheless only elevate him in the scale of dignity as a material being. The widest and sublimest knowledge in this region cannot enable him, of itself, to ascend that spiritual height which unites and identifies our existence of mortality with that of immortality, and after a few short and unsatisfactory years, will be of no use to the departing spirit, when he prepares to take his flight through the unexplored regions of infinitude. But the study of the truths with which the present subject is so intimately connected becomes more and more important, as the things of time and sense cease to interest and captivate. The mysteries there revealed, regarding the government and character of God, and the destiny of man, become infinite both in importance and extent; and while we trace, one after another, the bright paths of those who have ascended, from the lowliness and corruption of this earth, to "glory, and honour, and immortality," we are drawn, by the force of a heavenly persuasion and undoubting confidence dwelling within us, to "follow those who, through faith and patience, are now inheriting the promises" of God.

DIRECTIONS FOR PLACING THE PLATES.

ENGRAVED AFTER THE ANCIENT MASTERS.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|---------------------|
| THE LAST SUPPER, | - | - | - | - | <i>Leonardo da Vinci,</i> | To face Title-page. |
| HOLY FAMILY, | - | - | - | - | <i>Raphael,</i> | Engraved Title. |
| CHRIST CROWNED WITH THORNS, | - | - | - | - | <i>Titian,</i> | 100 |
| CHRIST AND THE TWO DISCIPLES AT EMMAUS, | - | - | - | - | <i>Titian,</i> | 230 |
| KING DAVID, | - | - | - | - | <i>Dominichino,</i> | 257 |
| SALOME BEARING THE HEAD OF ST JOHN THE BAPTIST, | - | - | - | - | <i>Lucas de Leyden,</i> | 368 |
| THE RAISING OF LAZARUS, | - | - | - | - | <i>Guerchino,</i> | 487 |
| THE TAKING DOWN FROM THE CROSS, | - | - | - | - | <i>Rubens,</i> | 517 |
| THE TRANSFIGURATION, | - | - | - | - | <i>Raphael,</i> | 639 |
| ST MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL OVERTHROWING SATAN, | - | - | - | - | <i>Raphael.</i> | |

. For a LIST OF THE AUTHORITIES consulted and referred to in the compilation of this Work, see the List prefixed to "THE SCRIPTURE GAZETTEER," published uniformly with the Scripture Biography.

THE SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY.

BIOGRAPHY

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

THE LIFE, MIRACLES, AND DOCTRINES OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

THE only infallible and perfectly authentic documents from which to compile a narrative of THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST, are the short accounts written by those who attended him through the whole course of his ministry, or received from their mouths, and written out by the other inspired Evangelists. The design of none of these, was to give a full account of all that he said and did. They inform us, indeed, that their object was very different—to give such a short and plain account of his doctrines and miracles, that those who read the memoirs might know the principles of those doctrines which they were called upon to believe, and the evidence upon which their belief was to rest. In those days when, the writing of books and the multiplying of copies was very different from what such employments are now, and when the incessant labours of the Apostles and Evangelists occupied nearly all their time, their object was to write out such an account as could be soon and greatly multiplied, in such a way as to be in the possession of every believer. But with those who take the benefit of what they have written for our instruction, the object is to interweave, in a continuous narrative, the various facts and illustrations which they have left us. This, in all ages of the church, has been done by many eminent individuals, of whose labours the writer of the present Biography has availed himself. Instead of loading the margin of every page with references to these and the particular parts of their labours, of which use has been made, it was thought preferable to make a general acknowledgment once for all, and refer others who may wish to study the subject more deeply to profitable sources of information. Besides the inspired writers of the Sacred Narrative, the compiler of this portion of the present work has to acknowledge obligations to the following writers:—In antiquities, and the manners and customs of the Jews, *Josephus*, the contemporary Jewish historian; *Jenning's Jewish Antiquities*; *Cuneus de Republica Hebræorum*; *Hadriani Relandi Antiquitates Sacre Veterum Hebræorum*. In connexion with the Contemporary History, he has consulted the tenth volume of *Ancient Universal History*, *Dupin*, and the common profane authors of the period. For the Narrative he has consulted *Taylor*, *Fleetwood*, *Clarke*, (whose work is a slavish plagiarism of *Fleetwood*), *Hall's Meditations*, *Robinson's Scripture Characters*, and Dr *Welsh's* article on the subject in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. For the harmony of the Evangelists and chronological order of events, great obligations are due to the very learned work of *Macknight*, and to a new and ingenious *Harmony of the Gospels*, compiled by a layman of London, in 1836. In a field where such a multitude of labourers have devoted the high talents, which God had given them, to his service, it would be extravagant to attempt, or pretend to any thing new, either in argument, or narrative, or illustration; but the object at which the writer of the following pages aims, is somewhat different from that which any of the writers mentioned seems to have had in view. If he has at all approached to success in following out his plan, it will be unnecessary to explain it to those who have read the human compositions upon this most important of all subjects of the meditation and belief of man, and he will not have spent altogether in vain the hours which he has devoted to the study.

In a Scripture Biography, the reason will be obvious to all our readers why that of **JESUS CHRIST** should precede the others. He is the **AUTHOR** of all truth and of all salvation—to Him all prophets and apostles testify as their Lord and Master—the patriarchs of ancient faith looked forward to Him as the object of their hope and rejoicing, and kings derived all their power from Him who was **KING OF KINGS**, and held and exercised it for the accomplishment of the ends of his overruling and supreme government. He is **THE ANCIENT OF DAYS**; and the rank which they held, and the part which they were ordained to act under Him, will be best understood, and will most naturally follow, the life of Him who reveals and explains all. The prominent importance of the subject will also account for the different form in which it is printed, across the page instead of in columns, in which shape the remaining part of the work will be published.

THE work which **JESUS CHRIST** came into the world to perform is, we have every reason to believe, the most important in the history of eternity. In it alone is the character of God made known to all created intelligence, as it is in reality. Without such a demonstration, he could not have been known to be at once just and merciful. In the fall and punishment of the rebel angels, his holiness was demonstrated, but his creatures could not thence learn that the attribute of mercy had any dwelling-place in the bosom of divinity. Had the sentence of condemnation passed upon man for his transgression been executed upon all the race, compassion, mercy, grace, salvation, would have been unknown; had an act of pardon been passed in the council of heaven, without a demonstration of unchangeable hatred against all sin, the intelligent creation would still have had no means of understanding the true nature of the divine holiness. It is in the history of the fall, and condemnation, and redemption of mankind, that God is revealed to his finite creatures. We have no direct means of knowing whether the inhabitants of any other world, among the many millions that circulate in glory round the throne of the Eternal, have broken the laws of their Creator, and fallen from the state in which they were placed; but from the fact which is made known to us, that the manifold wisdom of God is here displayed to the contemplation of the principalities and powers of heaven, we may conclude that our world is the only exception. And from the additional fact which is also revealed to us, that these bright spirits of intelligence and love delight to ponder and look into that great mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh—we are authorised to conclude that a flood of light is thence thrown, even to them, upon the principles of the moral government of the universe. The government and destiny of this world, then, have an influence of the sublimest character upon the future history of eternity. That government, from the commencement of time to its close, depends altogether upon Jesus Christ, the Mediator, and the work which on this earth he performed. All the preceding mighty movements of its history prepared for his entrance upon the undertaking; the events which are yet hid in the distant future shall all, in their turn, subserve to the development of the great plan which was decreed in the councils of heaven. Christ now reigneth in righteousness, the merciful Judge, the omnipotent Saviour, and he will reign till he hath put all things under his feet. Then shall the great white throne of judgment be displayed in the heavens, the mysterious ways of God will be justified in the eyes of all his creatures, the remedial dispensation shall end, and all present seeming imperfection appear the absolute perfection of infinite wisdom, and infinite goodness.

It is clear, then, that the history of Jesus Christ, and of the great work which he came to accomplish, is the only key with which we can open up the treasure-house of wisdom that God has set before man in the government of the world. The history of his life is the history of the fate of the world—is the history, as far as

we can possibly know, of the only manifestation which God has made of all his character to his finite and intelligent creation. If we can understand it aright, we will be able to ascend high above the sphere of the discoveries of natural reason, to pass beyond the utmost verge of the finite, and place our feet on the ascending steps of that ladder, which, fixed on earth, arises to the infinite and invisible, and is calculated and designed to elevate the material creature to a rank of knowledge and of glory, in which the cherub and seraph, who never fell, rejoice in the uncreated brightness of the visible and immediate presence of the Father of all. But the difficulty of conceiving such a character, in all its parts and bearings, as that of the great Mediator between God and his creatures must be, is very obvious. The finite cannot comprehend or hold intercourse with the infinite. To make himself known to even the most exalted of his creatures, the infinite Creator must contract himself to the limits of the finite, he must come forth from the invisible depths of his infinitude, and appear before his creatures in such an embodied *person* as they can look upon, as they can hold intelligible intercourse with. It is only by placing man upon the material vantage-ground of things known and present, that the Spirit can give him as perfect ideas of things spiritual and invisible, and unknown, as his limited and imperfect mind is now capable of receiving. The great Author of all truth, and of all love to his creatures, has done this in a way which infinite wisdom could alone have conceived. God has to outward appearance emptied himself of his divinity—he has condescended to the level of the lowest of his fallen intelligent creatures, that he might make the truth of heaven dwell on earth, that by his union in nature with them, and by ingrafting the principles of eternal truth within them, he might make them partakers of a divine nature, and by the golden chain of justice and mercy might again unite the lowest of his moral creation in harmonious sympathy with the infinitude of his own holiness.

The character of Christ, then, is the embodied personation of the truth and wisdom, of the virtue and holiness, of the excellence and perfection of the divine character—and all this exhibited to our contemplation, not in the divine or arch-angelic or angelic character, but in that of feeble, and helpless, and suffering man. It is evident that it must be very difficult for us to conceive the perfection of such a character; it must be much more difficult still to give a faithful and full delineation of it so as to make it understood and felt correctly and fully. It has been set before us, indeed, in that word of truth which cannot err—in those scriptures which are given by the inspiration of the God of truth; but from the time when he spoke to Adam after the Fall, in the language of prophetic symbol, till the time when the eternal Son of the eternal Father took to himself a material body and a reasonable soul, he spoke to man as a child in knowledge and a child in faith. He gave them line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, in proportion as they were trained on to understand the spiritual truth, and prepared to receive it. We have said that the history of God's mediatory government of the world is the history of Jesus Christ, and no one can read the Old Testament with any attention, without feeling the thorough conviction that the principles of that government there developed are only elementary and preparatory. Man in his fallen state could not look beyond the confines of the material—he could not pierce, with the eyes of his understanding, the infinite darkness that stretched up from the sphere of his attainable knowledge toward the infinite Father. Therefore did God, in his mercy, condescend to pass through that mysterious vail which separates the visible and material from the invisible and spiritual. He made himself known as a present God, conversed with his creatures face to face, gave them his

laws and his covenant, enforced their authority by direct interposition of general or individual judgments, established a regular series of divinely-commissioned messengers to declare his will, to explain his laws, to announce the future opening up of the plan of his government, and thus impress upon the conviction of the world a truth which we believe men could not have otherwise discovered—that there was a God who ruled over them, who required their obedience, who was the ever present and omniscient witness, and the rewarder and punisher of their actions. The great general end of the theocracy was to make known to the world the true character of God, as a God of infinite and unchangeable holiness—to make known to man his true character, as a being altogether sinful, and incapable of himself of satisfying the law of that nature in which he was created. By its visible symbolic rites and ceremonies of mysterious meaning, where more was meant than met the eye, it pointed the faith of man onward to a vicarious sacrifice of atonement which was to reconcile the Creator and the creature, the Lawgiver and his subjects.

In the view we design to give of the life of the Saviour of the world, we conceive these remarks are necessary to enable us to understand the nature of those expectations which his chosen people had formed of him, and of the prejudices which made them so grossly misconceive his character. We will more properly understand these when we come to consider the various events of his life, as they are recorded by those who were his disciples and faithful witnesses. At present, from the nature of the subject, it will be necessary to take a rapid glance at a few of the many prophecies which pointed to his coming, and darkly or clearly announced to man the nature of his undertaking, and the character of his person and of his kingdom. When the merciful Judge pronounced the sentence on our first parents after the Fall, he gave them a mysterious hope of a deliverance from the curse, of a remedy for the evil of their state, in the promise, that “the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head, and that the serpent should bruise his heel.” We know, from the names which they gave to the three first of their sons, that they looked for the immediate coming of the conqueror who was to deliver them from the consequences of their transgression. Down through all the generations till the Flood, we find similar proofs of the same hope. The promise was again made to Shem, the son of Noah, that the blessing should be in his family. To Abraham, however, who was called to separate himself from the already idolatrous nations of the East, it was much more clearly revealed, that “in his seed, or son, all families of the earth should be blessed.” This promise was frequently repeated, in similar terms, to him, and to Isaac, and to Jacob. This last patriarch prophesied, at his death, that the promise should be fulfilled in the family of Judah, “that the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh came.” Moses prophesied, that “the Lord would raise them a prophet like unto him, to whom they should hearken.” We need not allude particularly to the prophecy of Balaam, in regard to the “Star that should come out of Jacob, the sceptre of Israel,—he that should come from Jacob, and should have the dominion.” At the commencement of every new period of the history of the chosen people, the promise was renewed, lest it should drop out of the national faith, or lest the people should take any one of their great prophets or deliverers for the individual in whom it was fulfilled. To David it was revealed, for instance, that his “house and kingdom should be established for ever, that his throne should be established for ever.” We may pass over all the prophecies of Isaiah, which are so particular and descriptive, that he has justly been called the Evangelical Prophet. Daniel, in the land of the stranger, and in the days of dark-

ness, and oppression, and despair, had his own faith and hopes cheered, and was commissioned to cheer the hopes of his countrymen by many prophecies, especially by that most striking prediction pointing to the exact time of the coming of "Messiah the Prince, who should finish transgression, and make an end of sin—make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in an everlasting righteousness, and seal up the vision and the prophecy." All this was to be accomplished within "seventy weeks" of prophetic years, or 490 years, and should be executed by the Messiah being "cut off, but not for himself." Micah foretold that he should come from Bethlehem Ephratah. Haggai, who prophesied after the Captivity, and the building of the second temple, which wanted the ark of the covenant, the visible sacred presence, the Urin and Thummim breastplate, which gave glory to the first, predicted that the glory of this latter house should excel that of the former, since the Desire of all nations should come, and should fill the second temple with his glory. We need not allude to any more of the multitude of predictions, all more and more clearly pointing forward to the coming of the great Deliverer, as the increasing stream of prophecy rolled onward. The spirit of all prophecy is to give testimony to Christ, as the essence of all truth is dictated by his wisdom. The last warning voice which came forth from the invisible secrets of Heaven, and with which the canon of the preparatory record of truth closed, prepared the expectant people of God for the coming of the harbinger of their great King and Deliverer. Elijah, the prophet, was to be sent before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord, to prepare his way, and announce his coming.

It is evident that this is a regular and ascending scheme of prophecy, which was planned from the beginning, and gradually made fuller and more definite, as age after age passed away. Still onward from the very first, there is no faltering or ambiguity; no hesitation or doubt, in regard to the fact that one person was to accomplish the great work of the deliverance of man; that he should suffer in the contest, but should be triumphantly victorious; that he should be poor and despised, persecuted, rejected, and cut off; yet that he should subdue all nations to himself; that the multitude of peoples and tribes and tongues should flock to his victorious banner, and bow to him the knee of willing and delighted homage; and that he should rule in righteousness and peace, and sit upon the throne of his father David for ever. Had there not been this regular succession of prophets, and gradual development of the future plan of God's government of the world, in justice combined with mercy, under a Mediator, we can easily conceive that the first promise to the parents of our race would have been soon forgot. All nations would have sunk into gross idolatry, grosser ignorance of the character of God, of their own origin and condition, and future destiny. This is not matter of conjecture; for the history of the world, in all its nations, and throughout all the stages of its progress, proves that its advancement in knowledge and social civilization was no approach toward a more correct knowledge of the true God, of the dependence of the creatures upon him, and their relation to him as his responsible subjects. He never left himself without many a witness, to testify to his intelligent offspring of his presence and overruling power. The attributes of the invisible Deity were written in sublime characters upon the works of his hands; and man, by the right use of his intelligent faculties, might have ascended along the golden chain of the visible creation, to the throne and dwelling-place of the invisible Creator.

But this was not by any means the case, so far as the influential moral knowledge of God was concerned. The profound discoveries and scientific inventions of man

have no natural tendency to lead him upward to the knowledge of God, but only to elevate him to a high and atheistic conceit of his own dignity and power. Age after age, as man advanced in knowledge, he became, when left to himself, more ignorant of the character of the moral Governor of the universe ;—as he advanced in the arts of civil government and refinement, he became more grossly immoral, and sank more deeply in the pollution of vice and the enormity of crime.

This leads us to make a very important remark upon that “fulness of time” in which God sent his only-begotten Son into the world. Why did the great Deliverer so long delay his coming? Why did he allow the great tyrant of evil to establish his dominion on earth, and enthrone himself in the veneration and obedience of its inhabitants? Why did he permit the festering leprosy of sin to prevail as a universal pestilence, when the remedy was in his own hands, when it was promised and could at any time have been applied? It was that he might prove to man the insufficiency of his own unaided reason to lead him to the truth,—the inadequacy of his own powers to raise him to holiness—the incapacity of man for finding happiness, of himself, in created things or material enjoyments. It was that, by convincing and melancholy experience, he might teach his intelligent creatures that their only dependence was upon him,—that their only standing was in his strength. This he did amply, but not too amply, in the long probation of 4000 years. We are not particularly acquainted with the state of civil society and knowledge which men had attained before the Flood. From some hints given we are inclined to think that they had made no inconsiderable advances in the arts and sciences of civilization. Their long lives, reaching nearly 1000 years, gave them advantages which none of the race afterward could enjoy ; yet, though many thousands were alive at the Flood who had conversed with Adam, and who must have had the condemnation of their race, the threats and promises uttered in the Garden of Eden, still ringing in their ears, almost universal atheism and corruption, violence and bloodshed, prevailed over the earth. That giant race of earth-born gods were swept away, the world was purified of its bloody pollution, the covenant was renewed and extended, with clearer promises and firmer sanctions, to the patriarchs who were saved from that universal judgment. Yet Noah and his sons were not gathered to the dust of their fathers, till their descendants had again forgot the God who had preserved them, forsaken the law he had given them, and were worshipping the idol gods, the workmanship of their own hands. The world was tried under the primitive simplicity of the patriarchal government, and under it men soon forgot God. That system naturally merged into mighty monarchies, with sovereigns of absolute power. They soon became atheists, and commanded themselves to be worshipped as the gods of their people. But the towering pride of Babylon, which would have ascended to heaven, was in process of time smote by the withering blast of moral pestilence. The history of the world without God is only the history of its folly, its crimes, and its misery. Under the warlike and temperate Persian dynasty, with firmer and more equitable laws, men were as far from knowing God, or attaining perfection, as before. Then arose, in fascinating splendour, the glory of the Grecian power. Arts and sciences burst forth in unrivalled perfection ; philosophy carried the ardent researches of the human mind as deep into moral speculations as it has ever since penetrated ; poetry of the most unequalled sublimity elevated and refined the imagination and the taste ; liberty and the free institution of republican governments held forth the high inducements to noble minds to become the benefactors of their country ; and the human mind, emancipated from the depressing weight of absolute tyranny, seemed to the anxious eye of hope destined to attain the

height of human perfection, and to discover all the truth which it was necessary for man to know. Alas ! the bright gleam of hope was only like the lurid and fierce glare which the volcano throws up in the thick darkness of night. Socrates, the wisest of the sages of Greece, who has been called the apostle of natural reason, but who, there is some reason to suppose, borrowed a light from a more sacred source, came to the melancholy but true conclusion, that human research could lead the mind to no certain and sanctioned principles of belief,—that there was need for a teacher sent from God to lead men into the truth of heaven. He and his humble and practical philosophy were soon forgot ; the acute and speculative Greek wandered into more extravagant mazes of error, and sank deeper in moral debasement and corruption than men had done under the dynasties under which the world had suffered and groaned before. Last of all, look to Rome, which from a small beginning rose by different means to greater, more solid, and almost universal power, than all the governments which had gone before. Severe laws, stern frugality, rigid military discipline, and selfish love of country, gradually raised the ambitious republic to an overawing height, before which the mightiest monarchs of the earth crouched in submissive dread. From the barren sands of the African desert to the everlasting snows of Scythia, from the banks of the Euphrates to the shores of Britain, her iron legions had trampled in the dust the effeminate corruption of ancient empires, as well as the savage barbarism of Northern Europe. The Romans laid no claim to the philosophic and inquiring spirit of the Greeks, but they boasted of their religion and strict morality. We would not dignify with the name of religion the gross and abject superstition of idolatry ; and the morality of those who worshipped gods to whom they ascribed acts which would have disgraced the basest of men, cannot be expected to be pure, or founded upon any correct principle. Even in the simplest and purest periods of their history as a people, they were unjust, and cruel, and oppressive, immoral and licentious, to the widest extent. When possessed of unresisted power, and when the wealth of all the world flowed upon them, their boasted religion and severe morality degenerated into the grossest atheism, and the most abandoned licentiousness, with which the world had ever been previously polluted and God insulted. Thus, historians and satirical poets draw pictures of abomination which the foulest imagination can scarcely conceive, which our language fortunately has no words to translate.

If we were to class the different stages of that progress under distinct heads, they would be the following:—The pastoral and patriarchal, or the simple state of society—the absolute despotism, where the will of the sovereign was the only law—then a monarchy, restricted to some extent by constitutional law—then the ardent and boundless spirit of republican freedom—that, again, merging gradually and naturally into a military despotism—finally, the Roman, a mixture of all, republican, aristocratic, military, and imperial, bound together and kept in subordination, in name at least, by a system of laws, which the experience and wisdom of 700 years had progressively devised and adopted. Now, those who have read the history of the world know that, during the whole period of its being left to itself, to the trial of its wisdom and power, men were advancing rapidly in civilization and knowledge. But in all their acquired wisdom they knew not God ; they made no advances to the attainment of any knowledge of his character, of his laws, of the origin and present relation of man to his Creator, or of the means of propitiating his favour here, and enjoying happiness hereafter. Sacrifice universally prevailed—derived by tradition, no doubt, from the first of time—but with

their worship of the absurd deities of their pretended belief, it had degenerated into an unmeaning superstition. Their belief of an overruling providence, and of a state of retribution hereafter, in which the virtuous were to be rewarded, and the vicious punished, was a fond dream of the imagination, having its source in the wishes, and hopes, and fears of the human heart, rather than resting upon any satisfactory basis of proof which could satisfy the reason, or be a help to morality. The necessary consequence was, that the more man increased in knowledge and power, the more was he qualified, the more was he inclined, to work all manner of iniquity with greediness. This is no false or exaggerated picture of the condition into which the world had sunk, and was, age after age, sinking more deeply and hopelessly. Those who have looked over the melancholy pages of that crime-polluted history, know that, like Ezekiel's roll, it is written within and without with characters of "mourning, and lamentation, and woe." In glancing along the dark record of those melancholy pages, it is painful, yet instructive, to contemplate the ardent, though abortive efforts, which were made by natural reason to pierce the palpable night of moral darkness, which had settled down in heaviest gloom over the world. There was, indeed, one fountain of perennial light upon earth, which had been kindled at the source of the uncreated essence of the light and the truth of heaven. This was fixed by God on the holy hill of Zion, where he deigned to place an earthly tabernacle, to build a material palace, from which he gave forth his laws, and progressively revealed his truth to that tribe whom he chose as a peculiar people and a royal priesthood, to maintain the memory of his name, and the reality of his government on the earth. It could not be, but that straggling rays of light from that ever-burning beacon of truth, should occasionally strike the wakeful and watching eye of individuals in neighbouring nations, who were anxiously endeavouring to explore the awful mystery of their condition. In the remaining books of heathen speculation, both in poetry and prose, we have the clearest proofs that the gleams of truth which occasionally drew their minds up from the depths of hopelessness, to points whence they could descry some hopes of the dawning of a better light, and a more certain truth came from the chosen earthly dwelling-place of the God of all truth. But these evanishing flashes of celestial light were calculated, as we question not they were intended, to make the darkness only more visible and palpable. That peculiar people were fenced in by a partition wall of distinctive rites and observances, which separated them from all other nations. Their religion was most particularly contrived to keep them distinct from all other people; and from the time when they were so set apart, God made it manifest that he was commencing the process of a great demonstration of the principles of his government, which, through their instrumentality, were to be most convincingly wrought out. It will be seen in the course of these pages how they subserved that plan. At present it is sufficient to state that, with regard to them also, the fulness of time was come. They should have known, from the prophecies given to their fathers, that the accepted year of the Lord, the period of their grand deliverance, to which all their prophecy pointed, was now come. They did, indeed, expect a deliverance—they did, indeed, require it—not in the way they expected, not in the manner they hoped—but in the very way and manner in which all the heathen nations had given proofs that they needed a heavenly instructor, a mighty deliverer, an omnipotent Saviour. They also, as well as the nations without the sacred pale of heavenly truth, had most grossly perverted the revealed truths of God, and had mixed up the religion which he had revealed to them, with the sanction of many divine commissions and proofs,

with glozing comments and vain traditions of their own. Though, at the time when our narration commences, they were zealous to the point of intolerant bigotry for what they conceived the law and religion of their fathers, we shall find that they had perverted the truth of God nearly as much and as fatally as the heathen. But as in the natural world the "darkest hour precedes the dawn," so in the spiritual world of the government of God, when darkness brooded over the nations of heathenism, and thick darkness over the people of his choice and ancient love, the period was come when the Dayspring from on high should dawn, when the Sun of eternal righteousness should cast the awakening and vivifying beams of his light upon those who had slumbered so long in the valley of darkness, in the region of the shadow of death.

Such was the hopeless and melancholy condition of the whole world at the time at which God had foretold that he would send the great Deliverer. The glory had departed from Israel, the sceptre had virtually fallen from the royal hand of Judah, and a lawgiver of the sacred line of David no longer sat upon his throne. Herod the Idumean, the son of the alien, lorded it in tyrannic pride and savage cruelty over the chosen heritage of God. The family of David were disinherited of the possession of their fathers, and reduced to lowliness and poverty. The family of Joseph, the unambitious carpenter of despised Nazareth, or of the equally poor Mary, his betrothed wife, had far other thoughts than looking to the throne of the chosen people, or of seeing fulfilled in their days the high hopes which had cheered their fathers in the gloom of captivity, the fiery furnace of persecution, and the oppression and thralldom of foreign tyrants. But to those who studied the prophecies and promises of God, these very circumstances were the sure signs that the night of their despair was far past, that the hopeful dawn of their joy and deliverance was at hand. In those days of false zeal, of corruption of truth and depravity of life, there were still many who "waited day and night for the consolation of Israel." Among these Zechariah the priest, who was ministering in his course in the service of the temple, was visited by the same angel Gabriel who had foretold to Daniel the coming of the Messiah. He now came to announce through this pious priest to the people of Israel, that the time of their deliverance was drawing nigh, and that the prayers of the faithful were heard. That every thing connected with this might excite attention, he told the aged priest that his wife, who was childless, and also aged, should give miraculous birth to a son, who, in the spirit and power of Elijah, should go before the King of Israel, and prepare the people for his coming. Other miraculous circumstances were connected with this birth, intended to confirm the faith of those more immediately connected with it.

But we have now to attend to the announcement of the birth of Him to whom all prophecy pointed, in whom it was all centred and fulfilled. The hopes of David's family were sunk to the lowest, but still in the bosom of every daughter of Judah, and especially of the consecrated lineage of the man according to God's own heart, we learn that the first of all desires was to give birth to the anointed deliverer of his oppressed people. Therefore, they never married out of their tribe, and Mary, descended of that family, was espoused to Joseph, who was nearest to the throne in the surviving line. But according to the custom of the Jews, the marriage was not immediately completed, and these humble heirs of vanished royalty were looking contentedly forward to a lowly life of poverty and hard labour. But in her lonely musings the same angel, Gabriel—the mighty one of God, as his name imports, one

of the highest, if not the very highest, of the principalities of Heaven—was sent to announce to her the most glorious message, the highest honour that ever was bestowed upon any daughter of Eve: "Hail, thou highly favoured, the Lord is with thee." The humble virgin was no doubt amazed equally at the messenger and the message, but he calmed her alarm, and announced plainly that she should give birth to the "Son of the Highest," that "the Lord God would give to him the throne of his father David, that he should reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and that of his kingdom there should be no end." He explained how this birth should take place, and removed all her doubts and fears, filling her heart with such joy as no other could ever be inspired with. It is beyond our purpose, as it is certainly above the reach of possible and legitimate inquiry, to examine too narrowly into the nature of that mysterious union, of that miraculous birth. It was the doing of God with whom nothing is impossible; and when he interferes with the purpose of manifesting his will or his works to his creatures, all is out of the ordinary course of nature.

As a sign to confirm the virgin's faith, the angel had told her of the preternatural conception of her cousin Elisabeth, "the fruitfulness of whose age did somewhat suit the fruitfulness of her virginity." While they mutually saluted in raptures of joy, and had their faith equally confirmed, the unborn harbinger exulted in conscious joy at the presence of his unborn Lord and Saviour.* We are entitled to conclude, from the dates given, and Mary's residence for three months in the house of Zechariah, that she witnessed the birth of the forerunner of the Messiah. The additional miraculous circumstances which accompanied that event served to arouse the attention and expectation of those who dwelt in that neighbourhood, that God was indeed, according to the inspired declaration of Zechariah, about to "visit and redeem his people, and to raise up to them a horn of power and salvation in the house of his servant David."

Mary returned to her lowly abode in the distant Nazareth; and to show her that the glory and joy which God had given her were not to be unalloyed with those sorrows and grievances which are the lot of fallen and sinful humanity, Joseph had observed with bitterness, that his espoused and beloved wife was in a state in which no unmarried woman, no chaste virgin could be, or ought to be. But while he meditated in sorrow on the blasted hopes of his anticipated happiness, and was designing to escape the shame of an apparently adulterous alliance by a private divorce, the angel of God announced to him the truth of the miraculous conception, and the character and office of him who was to be his adopted son: in her was to be fulfilled the ancient prophecy, which had foretold that a virgin should conceive, and bring forth a son, who was Emmanuel—God in the human nature. Joseph therefore took the virgin mother to his house, and, by a union according to law, became the legal father of him who was soon to be born.

But while they designed to await that event in their accustomed residence at Nazareth, other events, to all obvious appearance of a much more important character, were going on, which proved that the grand march of prophecy was carrying forward. Herod, by his capricious tyranny, had given some offence to Augustus,

* As far as is recorded, this is the last time these holy and highly honoured women met. Zechariah is supposed to have been murdered in the temple shortly after, and Elisabeth to have died, while her miraculously born son was yet in his boyhood. He lived in the wilderness remote from society, and led a self-denied and austere life, brought up, as is conjectured, among the hermitical Essenes, the least worldly, and in reality the strictest sect among the Jews at that time.

by whose permission and under whose protection alone he reigned, and that lord of the world had sent an order that a census of the whole population of Judea should be taken. This was done for the purpose of imposing a tax upon the nation, and to prove to the crafty and ambitious Herod that he was only a vassal king; but it proved also the prediction uttered 1700 years before by Jacob, of the final departure of the independent sceptre from Judah, and it tended to fulfil the prophecy given in Micah, that he who was to take up and sway the fallen power of David should be born in Bethlehem of Judah. For it was necessary, according to the Jewish law, that every family should be registered in the city, and by the property of their fathers. The law of the jubilee year, according to which the property assigned by lot, in the first distribution, in the days of Joshua, to each family, should be restored, however alienated, to that family, had long fallen into disuse, and the patrimonial inheritance of Jesse and David had for ever passed away from the hope of their descendant; yet, by this act of the governor of the world, and by the plan adopted by Herod to put it into execution, every family of the land was registered according to the books of their national genealogies. Thus was Joseph brought, probably greatly against his will, to the city of his fathers, and Mary, either from choice, or to enrol for herself, as claiming upon the same relation, was carried with him. Slowly and painfully, in her condition, must they have performed the toilsome journey, of nearly ninety miles, from Nazareth to Bethlehem, and severely must she have felt how she was to pay for the high dignity conferred upon her. Much had her simple mind yet to learn, and severely was her faith to be tried, ere she understood the character and government and kingdom of him to whom she was to give birth.

Whatever were her personal motives for accompanying her husband to Bethlehem, the necessary slowness of their journey prevented them from reaching their destination in time to obtain proper accommodation. The son of David had no friend to receive him to his house—the public inn was crowded with strangers—the rightful heir of the throne of David had to lodge in a stable—the Creator, the Heir, the Restorer of all things, had to be laid in a manger, when he opened his eyes upon that world which he came to redeem and to govern. We know the cause of that humiliation, and, from the unfolded plan of the divine dispensation, can explain why he who was head of all principality and power, did not come attended with legions of angels—why he did not condescend to be born in Jerusalem, in the city and palace of his father David; but she who gave birth to the Lord of life knew not, and could not know. Her own hopes, confirmed by the “all hail!” and message of the angel, induced her to expect one who was to appear in glory and resistless power. She must have caught at, and rested her delighted expectation upon, the most obvious part of the prophecies, that he who was to ransom Israel, and deliver them from the power of their enemies, was to do it in the literal and direct sense. To this she and all the rest of her countrymen would naturally look, and forget the predicted intermediate stages, by which this glorious conquest was to be attained—that it was through the lowest humiliation that he was to ascend—that he was to be despised and rejected of men—that he who was the Lord of all was to empty himself of all his glory—that he was to claim no spot on earth where to lay his head, till he had conquered all his enemies, and gained the willing obedience, and conceded dominion, of the world to himself.

That consummation of glory and power Mary knew was to take place—she had, she must have had, full confidence in the fulfilment of what had been so lately fore-

told her in such supernatural circumstances, and, however her doubts overcast her hopes, and deeply perplexed her, she could not but know that the helpless child who lay before her, in such mean attire, and with such uncourtly attendance, was yet to be the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Prince of Peace, the Mighty Councillor, who would prove himself the Son of God, and the predicted Messiah of his people.

We could linger in imagination in that mean and lowly abode, and ponder with those who must have been so deeply interested and affected with the birth which had taken place. It had taken place in the silence and obscurity of a refuge not destined for the accommodation of man; yet, though the busy and sleepless world were totally inattentive to the most important event which was ever recorded in its annals—the most important which the history of eternity can ever unfold—the hierarchies of heaven, the watchers and the holy ones, were deeply interested, and keeping the vigils of heaven within the sphere of this earth. A company of simple shepherds were keeping watch by night over their flocks in the fields or hills near Bethlehem, when suddenly a glorious light shone around them, and an angel from the heavenly host appeared beside them, calmed the fears which his presence caused, by announcing the glad tidings of the birth of their long-expected Messiah. He told them where, and in what lowly condition, they would find this heir of David's throne, in the city of David. Then suddenly there appeared a multitude of the heavenly host, cherub and seraph, singing a choral hymn to this new-born heir of heaven and earth—"Glory to God in the highest heavens, peace on earth, and good-will to men." At the creation, the morning stars of the new heavens sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy; at the descent upon earth of Him, who called all their glory into being, to undertake the restoration to order and harmony of that creation in which sin and misery had so long rioted, they again strung their golden harps of heaven to a newer and a nobler strain.

After the glorious and exulting band had delivered their message, and celebrated on earth the mysterious birth of the Sovereign of heaven, the wondering shepherds went, and found all circumstances as they had been told, and published the glorious tidings to the wondering neighbourhood. Mary and Joseph knew the character of the mysterious child, in general, as the Son of God, and Saviour of Israel; but it will be evident, in the course of this history, that their conceptions were very vague and indistinct, if not altogether erroneous, of the nature of his undertaking, and of his kingdom. That knowledge was communicated only very gradually, and these wonderful events were intended only to keep their faith alive, and turn the attention of the people to their Saviour and Messiah.* The chorus of the angelic

Much learned discussion has taken place in regard to the season of the year, and the particular year, when our Saviour was born. We do not intend to trouble our readers by entering into the questions here, as they are neither very useful nor entertaining. We refer those who wish to know the different opinions which have been advocated to the dissertations on the subject prefixed to "Macknight's Harmony of the Gospels;" Dr Welsh's article "Jesus" in the new edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and to other sources which they will find there pointed out. It was not till the sixth century of the Christian era that a monk of the name of Dionysius recommended and introduced the mode of calculating chronologically from the birth of our Saviour; and it is now generally agreed that this event took place four years earlier than the epoch which he assigns. In regard to the time of the year, Western Europe has agreed to observe the festival of its commemoration on the 25th of December, as the Greek church did on the 6th of January. But both of these are evidently erroneous. They rest upon the supposition that Zechariah was high priest, and that he was offering the annual expiation on the 10th of Tisri, corresponding to the 15th of September, when the angel appeared to him. Six months after that, when the same messenger appeared to Mary, would be the corresponding day of March, and the birth of our Saviour in December. But Zechariah was evidently not high priest, but only served, in his turn, one of the twenty-

song was "peace on earth, and good-will to men;" and when the Prince of Peace came, the warring nations of the world had ceased their strife, and hung their trumpets in the hall. The temple of Janus was shut at Rome, to indicate that the empire was in the enjoyment of profound peace:—

No war, nor battle's sound,
Was heard the world around;
The idle spear and shield were high uphung;
The hooked chariot stood,
Unstain'd with hostile blood;
The trumpet spake not to the armed throng,
And kings sat still with awful eye,
As if they surely knew their Sovereign Lord was by.
And peaceful was the night,
Wherein the Prince of Light
His reign of peace upon the earth began.

Such was the joy in heaven and peace on earth, when consolation was announced as at hand to the race which had so long pined in hopeless darkness, and groaned under sufferings which their guilt had caused, and which no sacrifice or device of theirs could remedy or avert.

But to Him who was the author of that peace and joy, there was to be no rest or worldly enjoyment. The compulsory and painful journey of his mother, and the borrowed accommodation of the stable of an inn, were types of the privations of the life of Him who had not where to lay his head. He had voluntarily taken upon himself perfect obedience to the law of that nature which he now assumed, and the various punishments of its transgression were to lie heavy upon him during his life of sorrows. He had subjected himself to the law of Moses, and, as a descendant of Abraham, he must undergo all its rites. He submitted on the eighth day to circumcision, like the other first-born of the Israelites; he had to be redeemed and devoted to the Lord, by sacrifice at the temple. After the forty days of ceremonial purification of Mary, who had conceived and brought forth the holy child in perfect purity, he was brought to the temple, the earthly palace of his Father, and ransomed at the lowest rate which was allowed to the poorest of Israel. Here, though he was not welcomed by the hosannahs of his people, nor the homage of their prince, nor the delighted veneration of the priests, he was not without welcome and honour. It had been revealed to the aged Simeon, that he should not depart till he had seen the Messiah. He came at the time of presentation, recognised his Saviour, and proclaimed his character to his parents, and to those present. Anna, also, a prophetess of very advanced age, who had been waiting from the time of an early widowhood for the consolation of the chosen people, proclaimed that this season of mercy had now come, and that the Son of Mary was the Redeemer of Israel. These wonderful events, and as wonderful announcements, were calculated to arrest the attention of the Jews, and to direct their consideration to the prophecies contained in the records of their faith, and to the signs of the times in which they

four courses instituted by David. Allusion is made in the 24th chap. 1 Chron., to the order of these courses; and, dating from the dedication of the temple in the time of the Maccabees, and making the same calculations, it is supposed that the birth of Christ took place in September. This season agrees better with the shepherds' watching in the fields than mid-winter, when the flocks were brought into folds. At best, however, this is only conjectural, and perhaps intentionally left in doubt, for the purpose of discountenancing superstitious observances of days.

lived. That they did so with many we know; but the anticipations of the Jews in regard to their deliverer were very different from the real character of Him who had now entered in lowliness and obscurity upon the mighty undertaking. Therefore, as old Simeon declared, he was set as a stumbling-block for the fall of many in Israel.

After these events, and the striking fulfilment of so many prophecies, by means of those who knew not and thought not of them, nor had any design to accomplish them, Joseph and Mary returned for a time to their home in the Galilean Nazareth. But it was not to reside there, but only to arrange their affairs, in order to return and reside at Bethlehem; for it would seem they had imagined that it was in the city of David that the heir of his kingdom should be brought up to the high office to which they understood he was destined.

We have reason to conclude that they lived here in lowly and peaceful obscurity for about a year. But then one of the most striking testimonies which had yet been given to the divine appointment of this new-born Saviour again called the attention of the whole nation toward him. We learn from the Roman historians, Tacitus and Suetonius, that not only in Judea, but over the whole East, "a traditional and firm belief had prevailed for many ages, that about this time an individual was to be born in Judea, who was destined to conquer and take upon himself the government of the whole world." These heathen historians knew not the origin or foundation of that universal belief; but we, who are acquainted with the prophecies given by God from ancient days, know that it was preserved among all the descendants of Abraham. The Arabian prophet Balaam alludes to it most distinctly, when he was brought by Balak to curse, but was compelled to bless, the Israelites, when he looked in prophetic vision to the distant future, and saw "the Star arising out of Jacob." Over the more distant East, the intercourse of the scattered tribes, and the prophecies of Daniel, made the expectation known. Zoroaster, the reformer of the Magian philosophy, is said to have been the servant and disciple of that prophet, and we can easily conceive that he preserved and disseminated among his followers many of the prophecies of his master. Whatever was the origin of the belief, the fact is certain, that, at the birth of Christ, a miraculous star appeared in the East, and travelled westward. We have reason to conclude, from what followed, that it was revealed by God to several of these Persian Magi that this was the long-expected Star of their hope; for a body of them followed its course, under the full confidence that it was to lead them to the presence of Him who was thus announced to them as now born King of the Jews. It guided them first, not to the humble abode of the tent-maker of Nazareth, but to Jerusalem, the capital of the nation. Here they told the cause of their coming, the belief which brought them thither, and their desire to pay adoration to this heaven-born King. We are told neither what was their rank nor their numbers, but their declaration and purpose caused a universal excitement in the city. The news of their arrival, and their purpose, soon reached the ears of the jealous and sanguinary Herod. He instantly summoned the high council of the nation, and put to them the question which had been asked by the Eastern Magi. They quoted the prophecy of Micah, to which we have alluded, and told him that the Christ was to be born in Bethlehem of Judea. The remorseless tyrant pretended delight, and having taken secure measures, as he thought, to cut off this new claimant of his usurped throne, dismissed the Magi to go and worship the King of Israel, and to return and conduct him to the same pious duty.

The star had disappeared when they approached the "palace of the great king," where it was natural that they should get information. But after they had published the testimony of distant lands to the belief of the birth of a universal Saviour-King, and had left behind them the walls of the wondering Jerusalem, their heavenly guide reappeared, to their great joy, and led them directly to the house in which Joseph and Mary had now found a temporary refuge. They paid their devout adoration, and, in testimony of their believing homage, poured out from their treasures the rich products of the East, "gold and frankincense and myrrh." They had designed to return to Jerusalem, and give Herod the information which he requested with such appearance of interest and zeal; but, warned by that same heavenly guide who led them to their destination to avoid him, they returned to their own country by a different road. It is beyond our object and our space to inquire, as has been done at great length, into the character and professions of these Oriental sages, or to speculate upon the nature of the star which guided them, or the symbolic meaning of the gifts which they presented to Christ, as the object of their worship. It is enough to know, that they were favoured by a revelation that the birth of a predicted King had taken place—that they were conducted into his presence, to pay the homage of the Gentile nations to him, as one who was to enlighten their darkness, as well as to be the glory of his own people Israel. We are not entitled to suppose that they were favoured with more particular revelation of the nature of his kingdom than the saints of the days of old, or the believing Jews of that day, who were looking for the deliverance and consolation of Israel. All of these seem to have had only faint and vague ideas of the spiritual nature of Messiah's kingdom, and we have no grounds to believe that the Persian Magi were favoured above the faithful children of the Father of the Faithful.*

The hypocritical cunning of the remorseless tyrant Herod overshot its mark. Bethlehem was only five or six short miles from Jerusalem, and he thought it impossible that his intended victim could escape him. Therefore, he neither accompanied the inquiring Magi, nor took the precaution of sending his guards along with them to execute his bloody work. But, when he found that the Magi of the East did not return, and that his plot was balked, in the frenzied passion, which for many a year was his natural disposition, he sent his executioners, and slew every child of Bethlehem and its neighbourhood under two years of age. The wailing lamentation of "Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they were not," which is so beautifully and pathetically adapted by St Matthew from the prophecies of Jeremiah to the barbarous carnage, was pleasant music to the ears of the jealous tyrant. He thought that he could control the course of events, and falsify the prediction to which the Jews looked with hopes fatal to him and the dominion of his family. He was not ignorant of the prophecies to which the anxious expectation of the nation was directed. To fulfil these, if possible, in his own person or family, he had married a daughter of the royal and priestly Maccabean family, who had swayed the sceptre of Jewish power for about 150 years.

* This visit of the Eastern sages could not have taken place, as some have supposed, within 40 days after the birth of Christ, and before the presentation in the temple, because, immediately after they departed, the holy family fled into Egypt. But we are informed by Luke, that, after they came to the temple, they returned to Nazareth. They must have come again to the city of David, as we have supposed, though it is not particularly noticed. We are not informed how the Magi travelled; but if they came from Persia, as there is every reason to believe, many months must have been spent in the journey; for we are told, in the book of Ezra, that he took five months to travel from Babylon to Jerusalem. We may therefore reasonably suppose that they took twice that time.

But one after another of that race had fallen victims to his jealous tyranny. His queen, upon whom he doted with the fondest affection, and her sons, had fallen a sacrifice to the torturing fears of the tyrant. His remaining sons were the objects of his hatred or dread, and his reckless domestic cruelty was so unsparing, that the Roman Augustus is reported to have said, in bitter irony, that "he would rather be the sow than the son of Herod."

But the object of his hate and his fear was watched over by a more sleepless eye, and protected by a mightier arm, than those of any earthly potentate. Joseph was warned in a dream, on the night when the Eastern worshippers visited his lowly abode, to flee into Egypt. The power of Him whose wisdom had turned the crafty counsel of the tyrant into foolishness, could have baffled the might of all his harnessed legions; but it was not according to the plan of infinite wisdom, that the "Son of man" should gain his victories in this world by the visibly outstretched and destructive arm of Omnipotence. Placed under all the conditions of feeble and suffering humanity, he was to undergo and fulfil them all in patience, and want, and sorrow. Like the chosen people of old, he went down into the land of oppression and bondage; and, in the circumstance of that land of the iron furnace of affliction to the peculiar tribe affording the Son of God protection from impending destruction, was verified the proverbial saying of the prophet Hosea, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," as Matthew remarks. We have no account in the gospels of the time, or place, or circumstance, of the sojourn in the land of Egypt. It has been recorded by Eusebius, and other ancient ecclesiastical historians, that they went first to Hermopolis in the Thebais, and that the infant Saviour being accidentally or designedly carried into one of the temples, all the statues of the idol gods fell prostrate before him, like Dagon before the ark, fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Lord shall come into Egypt, and her idols shall be moved at his presence."* We simply mention, without giving implicit credit to the tradition, that the Holy Family lived seven years in various parts of Egypt. At the end of the

* With this also accords a tradition recorded in regard to the silencing of the heathen oracles—the false gods within the shrine telling their votaries that an infant born in Judea had commanded them to be henceforth dumb. It has of late been perhaps too much the fashion to consider *all* the superstitions of heathen idolatry as the invention of a cunning priesthood or selfish politicians. We know from a surer record than the speculations of philosophy that the principalities of evil were permitted for ages to rule at will in the world, and deceive its willingly blinded inhabitants, and we do not see that there is any thing inconsistent with scripture in supposing that they made the very highest use of the superstitious belief of the world to accomplish their purposes of evil. Milton beautifully alludes to this tradition in the very sublime poem on the Nativity, from which we have already quoted.

*The lonely mountains o'er,
And the resounding shore,
A voice of weeping heard, and loud lament;
From haunted spring and dale,
Edged with poplar pale,
The parting genius is with sighing sent;
And the chill marble seems to sweat,
While each peculiar power foregives his wonted seat.
They feel from Judah's land
The dreaded Infant's hand,
The rays of Bethlehem blind their dusky eyes.
Our babe, to show his Godhead true,
Can in his swaddling bands control the damned crew.*

In a matter of this kind, we would be inclined to believe too much, rather than, with the neological sceptic, to believe too little. The fathers of the ancient church believed it, and many facts were handed down to them which are not recorded in the gospel.

period, Joseph was again instructed by a heavenly vision to return to the land of his fathers. Herod had died in the midst of most horrible torments, both bodily and mental, rioting till the last in the butchery of his own children, and of all to whom his power or savage cruelty could extend. Augustus divided his ample territories among his sons, giving to Archelaus, Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; to Herod Antipas, the greater part of Galilee, and the countries beyond Jordan; and to Philip, Batanea, Trachonitis, and some other districts.

Joseph, who knew the disposition of Archelaus to be as jealous and cruel as that of his father, feared to reside, as he had wished, so near the tyrant as Bethlehem, and retired to the more distant Nazareth, under the government of the more pacific Herod. Here our Saviour resided in obscurity till his public appearance upon his great mission. Thus were fulfilled the prophecies which foretold that Christ should be despised, and rejected, and traduced—for the term Nazarene was one of contempt and reproach even among the Galileans themselves.

The Evangelists relate with minute particularity all these great events—the miraculous signs in heaven and earth, which intimated to the Jews and Gentiles that a mighty era had commenced in the history of the world, or was about to open. This was necessary to confirm the faith of those who should afterwards believe in the great Saviour, for all, or most of the circumstances which they record, were predicted in ancient days, to aid the eye of faith in piercing through the mystic meaning of the material rites and ceremonies of the preparatory dispensation, and to descry, with a holy joy, the dawn of a brighter day, of a more spiritual worship, and of a plainer truth. But, from the time when the impotent rage of his cruel foes was baffled and eluded, and when Joseph returned to his humble occupation of carpenter, in the obscure and despised village of Nazareth, no miraculous circumstance occurred to announce to the world that the son of Mary was in any thing different from any other of the children of our common humanity. According to the ancient prophecy, he grew up unnoticed and unknown of those who gaze with admiration upon the rising sun of worldly splendour—he grew up like the low and tender plant of the valley, or like a root out of the dry ground.

Joseph and Mary, however, had treasured up and pondered all the wonderful revelations and miraculous occurrences which had taken place, and must have contemplated, with mingled hopes, and doubts, and fears, the unfolding dispositions and mind of their son, to whom such a wondrous destiny was assigned. It is altogether beyond our comprehension to understand or explain what was the mode of mysterious union, in which the omnipotent and infinite of Deity was made one person in the feeble and limited compass of a body of dust, and a human soul. We are only informed, and so far are we called to believe, that as he grew in stature, so he grew in knowledge, and in favour with God and man—that he had a true body and a reasonable soul, amenable, in all respects, to the laws of that humanity whose material form he had assumed.

One circumstance alone is mentioned during the long period of that life of lowly obscurity and silent meditation, which we would have indeed expected to find. At the age of twelve, every Jewish child became what they called a disciple of the law, and was bound thenceforth to repair to the three great festivals. He who took upon himself all obedience to the law of Sinai did not omit this, and at that age we meet him in the temple with his parents, at the festival of the Passover. But, unlike other children of such years, after he had entered under the formal discipline of the law, he made it not an unmeaning form. When his parents returned on their way

homeward, he remained still in the house of his heavenly Father, to hear and to learn the doctrines and the mode of teaching adopted by those Rabbis who sat in the chair of Moses, and expounded to the people the laws, and precepts, and prophecies, of the founder of their faith and their worship. We know that he had not been educated in any of the learned schools of the great doctors of Israel, yet, with parents who entertained such high hopes of his future life, and with such a pure and elevated soul as his, we may be sure that he had studied and deeply pondered the meaning and purport of the laws and ceremonies enjoined upon the chosen people by God. Joseph and Mary found him, on the third day after they were separated from him, sitting in the midst of the congregated wisdom of the masters of Israel, listening to their expositions, and asking them questions. He told Mary that he was about the work of his *Father*, and we are thence entitled to conclude that he proposed objections, and started questions and doubts in regard to the pretended traditions and conventional comments of these corrupt teachers, which, as the Evangelist hints, astonished them above measure. His parents were also greatly amazed, but it is evident that they did not understand what he meant by his Father's business. We will have many an occasion to observe that they, as well as the rest of the Jews, entertained very false notions of the character of the Messiah. From all that they had witnessed, they could not possibly disbelieve that this was indeed he, but the feebleness of human reason often came over them to stagger their faith, and set at nought the previously settled convictions of their hopes. We know not whether, or in what manner, he satisfied these doubts; but, like an obedient son, fulfilling all the righteousness of the law, he returned with them to Nazareth, and was subject to them. We might be naturally anxious to know how that holy Son of God passed the years of his youth, whether in lonely musing on the high work before him, amid the mountains of Galilee, or in benevolent and instructive intercourse with those around him, or in active and laborious employment, like his reputed father. But all this knowledge the Spirit of revelation has not thought fit to communicate to his church. We know only from an occasional hint that it is probable, when his age and strength fitted him for it, that he wrought at his father Joseph's menial employment; for those who afterwards heard him proclaim the truths which he was commissioned to teach, with convincing eloquence and divine authority, asked each other, in doubting wonder, whether that was not he whom they had known as the carpenter. This was probably rendered necessary by the death of Joseph, for this is the last occasion on which we meet with the husband of Mary, and we come to the conclusion that he had ceased from his labours before Jesus entered on his public ministry. This would render it necessary that the Son of man should submit to the lot of humanity which, in the garden of bliss, he himself had pronounced, and earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, for it does not appear certain that the virgin mother gave birth to any other son than the promised seed.

But, before that public manifestation of his mission took place, public events were gradually fulfilling and verifying the predictions of the prophets. Archelaus, by his caprice and ambitious tyranny, had disgusted the Jews, and given umbrage to the Emperor of the civilized world. Augustus had deprived him of his tetrarchate, and banished him into Gaul. Cyrenius had levied taxes in the name of the Roman sovereign, and, it would appear, had stamped the effigy and motto of the Cæsar upon the coin of Judea. Herod and Philip were either so cautious, or so weak, as to hold a doubtful and barely permissive rule over the districts which had been partitioned off to them. But all things gave clear intimation that the law of Sinai and the religion

of Moses must fall before the dark march of heathen abomination; and that the sceptre of independent and heaven-bestowed and protected power was now finally falling from the hand of the royal Judah. The bannered lion of his tribe was prostrate in the dust, and the legionary eagle had lighted on the holy hill of Zion;—the heathen banner of desolation, like the fiery sword of the cherub guard of Paradise, waved its resistless defiance over the gate of the Holy of Holies. The glory of Judah was gone, and the law of the alien and stranger had usurped the authority of Jehovah, the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.

The Saviour of the world had now lived thirty years in unnoticed obscurity; he had reached the age of manhood, and, according to the law of that nature which he had taken upon him, his faculties had attained their maturity. Augustus, who had pacified the world, and under whom the Prince of Peace was born, had been long departed, and the nations were groaning under the tyranny of Tiberius, one of the most degraded, and cruel, and rapacious despots that ever swayed the destiny of the world. Pontius Pilate, who, in avarice and rapacity, resembled his master, was procurator or governor of Judea, and the Jews, groaning under foreign oppression and extortion, had already listened to the professions of false Christs. But as the harbinger morning star ushers in the lord of the day, so John announced the approaching rise of the Sun of righteousness; as pioneers go before the march of earthly monarchs, to level hills and fill up valleys, so he came before to prepare the way of the King of kings. When the series of ancient prophets ended, one of the last voices of promise that came forth from the secret Council-chamber of Eternity announced that the messenger of the desired and expected King should appear in the spirit and power of Elijah; and now when the period of the fulness of the world's trial had come to an end, and given ample proof that man himself knew not, and could not know God, his voice summoned the self-denying hermit from the wilderness of Judea, to go forth and preach the doctrine of repentance and baptism to a newness of life, and the living faith of a hope soon to be realized. It is not our purpose to follow the Baptist, or to enter farther into the purport of his mission, than to say that, like Elijah, he came to preach the strictness of the law to a people who had totally perverted its spirit, to proclaim the coming fulfilment of the prophecy of deliverance to a nation who certainly expected a fulfilment, but very different from the real. To use the striking language of Bishop Hall, "John was the voice of a crier—Christ was the word of his Father. It was fit this voice should make a noise to the world, ere the Word of the Father should speak to it. John's note was still repentance—the axe to the root, the fan to the floor, the chaff to the fire. As his raiment, like Elijah's, was rough, so was his tongue; and if his food was wild honey, his speech was stinging locusts." The circumstances of his miraculous birth could scarcely be forgot, and when he appeared proclaiming in such circumstances the approach of the reign of their long-expected Messiah with such holy confidence, no wonder that his appearance, and the subject of his doctrine, caused a general excitement and attention. Multitudes of all classes flocked to him, and the power of his stern denunciations carrying conviction to their hearts, many were baptized by him, professing their belief in his doctrines, and in the Deliverer whom he promised.

The extraordinary impression made by his doctrines was beginning even to raise the belief that he was the Messiah, and not only the people, at all times so easily roused to high hopes, but even the priests, began to entertain a belief of this kind.

He plainly told them, when they sent an official embassy to inquire, that he was neither the prophet promised by Moses, nor the Messiah of Daniel's prediction, nor Elijah,* but only the voice from the desert, to announce to them that that prophet and Messiah, his Lord, was already amongst them.

Accordingly, the warning voice of John had not long sounded the loud note of preparation and repentance among the mountains of Judea, and by the banks of Jordan, when Jesus himself left his retreat in the distant Nazareth, and came among the multitude to bear witness to the validity of his commission, and the truth of his promise. Though sinless himself, and needing no repentance, nor the symbolic purification of a believing penitent, he had put himself under all the conditions of our sinful nature, and, as the representative of sinners, it behoved him to undergo the purifying rite. The Saviour and his prophetic harbinger had never seen each other face to face, but it was revealed to the Baptist that a heavenly sign should make him known. When, therefore, the meek and lowly Jesus came *as a sinner* among the converted and repentant sinners of Israel, John at first refused the rite, but being convinced by him to whom he would have served the most menial office, that it was incumbent upon even the sinless Saviour to fulfil all the righteousness of the still subsisting Mosaic law, he complied, and the undefiled Messiah received the administration of the purifying waters at the hand of his own servant and prophet.

At this point commenced the public entrance upon his great work ; and to solemnize it in a way to show to the universe of intelligent creation that the Infinite and finite were united, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Spirit descended like a dove and rested upon him, and from out the invisible depths of infinitude God the Father uttered the voice of his complacent love, " This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." To use the words of Dr Taylor, " This was the greatest meeting that ever was upon earth, where the whole cabinet of the mysterious Trinity was opened and shown, as much as the capacities of our present imperfections will permit ; the second person in the veil of humanity,—the third in the shape and with the motion of a dove,—but the first kept his primitive state; and as to the Israelites he gave notice, by way of caution, ye saw no shape, but ye heard a voice ; so now also God the Father gave testimony to his holy Son, and appeared only in a voice, without any visible representation." The Spirit of God, at the first creation, moved upon the dark and lifeless waters of the formless void of chaos, and brought light and order, life and beauty, out of the shapeless and motionless mass ; so this second visible descent of the creative and forming Spirit upon him who was the first-born of the Eternal, but the representative of sinful and fallen humanity, intimated that the work of the new creation was commenced, and that the hope of a brighter and spiritual life was now about to dawn upon a world slumbering in the gloom of a spiritual darkness.

The great struggle between evil and good was now to be decided in human nature. The voice of the Eternal from his throne in the heavens, anew announced the champion to all the host of spiritual intelligences, and the adversary of God and man was made aware, that the second Adam now awaited the assault of his temptation, to undo the evil consequences of sin and death which the transgression of the first had brought upon the world. But as the Israelites, after undergoing the sym-

* In making this disclaimer, it would appear, either that the Baptist did not thoroughly understand, or that, in modesty, he was unwilling to take to himself the honour of the high office which was assigned to him. A higher and wiser than he assures us that he was the promised Elijah. But John may be understood as answering to the letter of the question.

bolic baptism of the Red Sea, and being separated from the land of sin and bondage, were tried by forty years' pilgrimage in the desert—as Moses fasted forty days and nights before the giving of the law—as Elijah fasted in solitary meditation in the wilderness for the same period, when his bold and lofty zeal for the broken law brought him into deadly collision with those who trampled it under foot—in like manner Christ was led by the Spirit into the Wilderness to fast forty days and nights, to prepare his human soul, by solitary meditation, for an infinitely higher work than that of all these. We need not inquire into what is not revealed, and what we cannot know;—the solitary communing with his own thoughts, and the communing in prayer with his Father, which he carried on during that painful vigil and lengthened fast. It was here, in solitary conflict, that he first met with the enemy of God and man. Our first parents fell, by discontent with their allotted condition, distrust in the providence of God, and ambition; and the substitute of those who fell had now to encounter the victorious tempter, and defeat him on his own ground.

Full forty days he passed, whether on hill
 Sometimes, anon in shady vale, each night
 Under the covert of some ancient oak,
 Or cedar, to defend him from the dew,
 Or harboured in one cave, is not revealed;
 Nor tasted human food, nor hunger felt,
 Till those days ended; hungered then, at last,
 Among wild beasts, they at his sight grew mild,
 Nor sleeping him, nor waking harmed: his walk
 The fiery serpent fled, and noxious worm;
 The lion and fierce tiger glared aloof.
 But now an aged man in rural weeds
 Following, as seemed the quest of some stray ewe,
 Or withered sticks to gather, which might serve
 Against a winter's day, when winds blow keen,
 To warm him, wet returned from field at eve,
 He saw approach.

Milton thus introduces the old serpent making his approaches of temptation upon him whom he had heard announced as the Son of God. It does not appear that he, any more than those whom the Saviour came to redeem, or even the angels of glory, understood the full character of the Conqueror who had now come to bruise the head of his power, or the nature of that contest in which the victory was finally to be gained. On the contrary, he who makes the wrath of men to praise him, made use of the darker plots and deeper designs of the grand leader of the spiritual rebellion as the instrument with which his great demonstration of justice and mercy was to be made manifest. We need not prove that the temptation must be resisted, and the tempter overcome, in the sole strength and in strict obedience to the laws of the nature of him who had first sinned. The tempter cunningly attempted to shift it from this ground; and, as if by way of inquiry, requests a proof of Christ's being the Son of God, by converting a stone into bread, to satisfy the hunger that was now pressing hard upon him. Had he complied with this apparently simple request, it would have been a sinful distrust in the providence of that God who had hitherto, for forty days, sustained the weakness of his human nature against the assaults of hunger, and a transgression of the law. Therefore, Christ replies that the life of man depends not so much upon bread as upon obedience to every command of God.

This first attempt was an endeavour to induce the Son of man to distrust the providence of God; the next was to urge him to a presumptuous and overweening confidence in that providence. The enemy of truth is versant in the doctrines of Scripture, whatever be the means he uses to obtain a knowledge of these, and, in the second effort, persuades our Saviour to abuse and pervert a promise which is evidently applicable to him as man. He carries him to the battlements of the temple, and again asks him to prove his divinity by casting himself down thence in presence of the people. This attempt was also baffled by our Saviour's quoting the express law of obedience, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." We cannot but be astonished at the impious boldness of the third attempt upon Christ, if Satan really believed that he was the Son of God, which there is some reason to doubt. He that knew the Scripture so well must have known that the anointed Son of God was to inherit the kingdoms of the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth. He therefore traverses his ground of temptation, and represents himself as the ruler of the earth, and the giver of its kingdoms—as a proof of this, sets all their glory and pomp in pictured show before the humble son of the carpenter of Galilee, and promises to transfer his right, and make him universal monarch, if he would pay him the simple act of homage which such a glorious gift deserved. This blasphemous assumption of lying pride and rebellious usurpation at last provoked the meek and lowly Jesus, who let the tempter know that he understood his character and design, as well as the obedience which he owed to the only King of kings and Lord of lords, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Thus was the Son of man in human strength victorious over the most crafty wiles of the devil. In every one of the three points Eve and Adam transgressed—when they *coveted* what God had expressly restricted them from, when they thought they might safely *presume* upon God's overlooking the trespass, when they *indulged the ambition* of being like God, knowing good and evil. In every one of these respects, thousands every day more or less sin against God, upon infinitely less temptation than Christ victoriously threw aside. The prince of the powers of the air, the ruler of the darkened and superstitious nations of the world, now felt that his dominion was indeed shaken to its foundation—that he was about to fall from the heaven of that idolatrous worship to which the superstition of the misled and benighted nations of the earth had raised him. We know now, according to the consoling doctrine which Paul draws from this event, that our merciful and faithful High Priest, having been tempted in all things like us, can sympathize with the weakness of that humanity which, in his love to us, he bore, and can succour us when we also are tempted. This was the first open attempt of the enemy of the eternal happiness of man, and of the glory of God, to overcome the Captain of our salvation. But we learn from Matthew, that, though he retreated baffled from the assault, it was only for a time. There are ranks of subordination among evil spirits as well as among the angels of light and glory, and we have reason to conclude that the archangel of darkness summoned his legions of rebel spirits from their haunts and shrines, and that in every shape they watched and haunted the steps of Him, who, they would have now some suspicion, was about to put an end to their riot of evil and tyranny over the souls of, and unrestrained infliction of earthly misery upon, the sons of men.

It would be a mistaken idea, therefore, to suppose that Satan now retired from all farther opposition in upholding the dominion of evil—in strengthening the bulwarks of the kingdom of darkness. He set himself only more indefatigably and

desperately to work, and though, as far as is revealed to us, he henceforth avoided personal collision with Him whose holy breast was armed impenetrably with triple-mail against all the fiery darts of his warfare, yet he failed not to call into his service all agents, either in the flesh or spirit, who, he thought, could possibly obstruct the progress of the heavenly conqueror. True, every attempt only fell heavier in disappointment upon his own head; yet he hoped against any hope; and despair of final success only rendered him more desperate, though more impotent in his enmity and opposition.

John was still denouncing the sins of the Jews, preaching the doctrine of repentance, and baptizing multitudes who resorted to him into the profession of faith in the coming deliverer. Jesus returned, and again listened to the preaching of his forerunner, and here John gave the open testimony that Jesus, whom he had baptized, was that Lamb of God, slain symbolically from the foundation of the world, as the sacrifice for sin—the true substitute, who, by the sacrifice which he was to make of himself, was to bear the punishment of the sins of the world. This was language, evidently, which the crowds who resorted to him did not understand, but, coupled with other high epithets of dignity and honour which he applied to Jesus, it excited the curiosity of two of his disciples, Andrew, and probably John, who mentions the circumstance, but, as usual with him, suppresses his own name. These two followed Jesus, and being invited to the house where he lodged, spent the day with him; and from the conversation he had with them, were confirmed in their belief. These two communicate the intelligence to Philip and Simon, whom they bring to Christ. He gives an example of his divine knowledge of the character and dispositions of men, in the case of the latter, to whom he gave the name of Cephas, a rock; expressive of the firm boldness and decision which he displayed. Nathaniel also, though strongly prejudiced against believing that any prophet or excellent character could rise out of such a contemptible and degraded city as Nazareth, was convinced, by an instance of supernatural knowledge of the same kind, and expressed his veneration and belief in these striking words, “Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.”

Such were the beginnings of the discipleship of Christ. The attention of individuals was turned towards him; they sought his intercourse, conversed with him, and with each other, compared scripture with scripture, and with what they witnessed and heard, and found themselves drawn to the certain conclusion, that this was indeed the prophet and deliverer of Israel, of whom Moses and the prophets had written. These, or most of them, by his invitation, followed him as his disciples, and were the witnesses of the future miracles which he performed, and the recorders of the doctrines which he taught. We can easily conceive the feelings with which their breasts were animated, the high hopes which they entertained, the glory and power to which they looked forward. They were Jews, and their highest and fondest hopes, and their strongly-rooted prejudices, were all Jewish, and chiefly, if not altogether, centred on earthly felicity and worldly glory.

John did no miracles, he uttered nothing that can strictly be called a prophecy, because his commission and office required the sanction of neither the one nor the other. But that of the Saviour of man was very different. He had to prove that he was infinitely above all the prophets in knowledge, and above all created beings in power. Therefore did he begin to confirm the faith of his disciples, by giving them a glorious manifestation of his miraculous power. It has been remarked by the philosophic Bacon, that there is a direct contrast between the miracles of our

Saviour introducing and confirming the religion of the Gospel, and almost all those which introduced and confirmed the preparatory dispensation of the Israelites. The first dispensation was one of judgment, intended to strike terror into the minds of men in regard to the insufferable holiness of God, his changeless hatred of all sin, and to manifest his determination to punish it. The dispensation of the Gospel is one of goodness and benevolence, intended to draw all men to the love of God, by the manifestation of his love to them—of his boundless compassion—of his exhaustless mercy. With the exception of the destruction of the Gadarene herd of swine, and the withering sentence pronounced on the barren fig-tree, the causes and circumstances of which we will afterwards explain, all the putting forth of the divine power of Christ exhibited a compassionate and benevolent disposition. This was eminently the case with the first miracle he is recorded to have performed. He had returned from the banks of the Jordan to the distant Galilee, and, with his disciples and his mother, was invited to be present at a marriage-feast in Cana. These nuptial feasts, among the Jews, lasted usually seven days, and hospitality was bountifully extended to all. The individual, it would seem, was poor, or not sufficiently provided with wine for the entertainment of such a company. He (says Bishop Hall) that made the first marriage in paradise, bestows his first miracle upon a Galilean marriage! His mother had pointed out the want to him, expecting, or perhaps wishing, that he would supply it. We need not detail the circumstances farther than to mention, that at his request the servants filled with water six large stone vessels, used for the purifying ablutions of the Jews, and ordered them to convey them to the master of the feast, and in the way the water was converted into wine. He was struck with its superior quality to what had been presented before. The bridegroom was applied to for an explanation of this departure from the common custom, and the miracle in all its circumstances was made known. We do not know the exact capacity of the measure, indicated by the word which John uses, and which is rendered by our translators “firkin,” but if, according to the common supposition, it contained $7\frac{1}{2}$ gallons, here was an exhibition of divine power beyond all cavil, and a seasonable marriage present, to one who was evidently not richly supplied with the luxuries or comforts of the world. The supply amounted by the calculation to above 100 gallons, superior to any which the vintage of Galilee produced. Moses, to prove to the Egyptians that he wrought by the high hand of God, turned the water of their river into blood, that comes by the destruction of life—Christ, to prove that he had command over the elements and laws of nature, converts water into wine, which is given by God to cheer the heart and the spirits of man. We may add another important general reflection of Bishop Hall’s on this miracle. “He that could have created wine immediately in those vessels, will rather turn water into wine. In all the course of his miracles, I do not find him making aught of nothing; all his great works are grounded upon former existences.—He multiplied the bread, he changed the water, he restored the withered limbs, he raised the dead, and still wrought upon that which was, and did not make that which was not.” Yes, his work of creation was accomplished long before,—he came not now to create, but to restore and regenerate the creature which had fallen, and become degenerate in sin, and all his miracles bore a direct or remote analogy to the great undertaking for which he had taken our nature.

Jesus had now announced that he had commenced his public ministry, and his life was henceforth one of constant and active labour. But he did not court the alliance or friendship of the mighty, or the noble, or the learned; he preferred the society of

the poor, the weak, the despised, that his doctrines might prevail, and his kingdom be established, not from the pomp and glory that dazzle the mind and attract the admiring homage of the worldly, not by the might of fleshly arm, and the victorious march of bannered warriors, as other systems have been established, but by the convincing power of the evidence of his commission, by the divine influence of the doctrines which he taught, when proclaimed even by the lowly and unlearned. His life was therefore to be one of wandering from place to place, without a spot upon that earth, which he came to redeem from the curse that blighted its primeval beauty and happiness, which he could call his own, upon which to rest his head—going about continually doing good, and liberally supplying the wants of others from the exhaustless stores of his bounty, but indebted to others for shelter from the rude inclemencies of the elements, and for the supply of his own necessities.

The first passover since he appeared in his predicted character was now at hand, and he who set a strict example of fulfilling all the enjoined observances of the law, went up with his disciples to give countenance to his own ordinance. But as all the religious principles of the Jews were now corrupted, the practices also of the public worship of the temple were divested of the sacred solemnity which had been observed in days of old. The sacred courts of the temple had become a den of thieves, and an exclusively selfish and worldly traffic was carried on, under the name of serving God, by those who sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, to the people who came to worship and sacrifice, and by those avaricious Jews who gained a living by exchanging, with profit, the current money of the country to those who came from a distant land to worship. Both these practices were expedient or necessary, but it was a profanation to carry on a usurious extortion, as those men did, in the consecrated inclosure of the temple. Therefore, he who knew not only their practices, but their motives, and the desires of their heart, assumed the character of a zealous and avenging judge—overthrew the tables of the extortioners, and scourged the worldly traffickers out of the courts of his Father's house. It must be plain to every one who reads the account of this transaction, that the meek and lowly Jesus must have assumed the severe and overawing dignity which overcame and prostrated all attempt at resistance. They made none; but though he was unattended by the parade of military power, or civil force, they were paralyzed by the heart-exploring look he gave them, and by the conscious conviction of the guilt which he pressed home upon them, and retired before the feeble scourge of small cords which he raised against them. The Lord, whom they ought to have sought, and been longing and praying for, had suddenly come to his own temple, and it was fit that he should banish thence every thing unworthy of his presence and of his worship. Such a proceeding, at such a time, when the many thousands, or rather millions, of the nation, were gathered together in commemoration of the most solemn of all their high favours at the hand of God, could not escape official notice. It was noticed, apparently, by the authorities who had established the profane practice by enactment or permission, and they required of him a proof of the commission which authorized him to interfere with arrangements which they had sanctioned. He gave them, designedly we doubt not, an ambiguous test, but evidently in such an overawing manner that put them to silence—"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." It was at last verified, in regard to the material temple of his human nature, in which the Spirit so fully dwelt, and his disciples afterwards noted that fulfilment, and it confirmed their faith. But the Jewish rulers took it in the direct application to the gorgeous building which had been repaired, and extended, and

adorned at such vast and sumptuous expenditure by the crafty Herod, and the ornamenting of which had been just newly completed. Certainly the expression admits of this alternative, and the rulers of the council taking it in this sense, and not being corrected by him who proposed it, we are inclined to think that it was the superhuman confidence with which the test was proposed that struck them with astonishment, and prevented them at the time from farther interfering with one who came invested with such power, and could make his influence and authority be so visibly and palpably felt and obeyed.

He thus passed untouched and unharmed through that Lazar-house of moral and spiritual pollution. None presumed to lay hands upon one who so powerfully, yet peaceably, enforced every thing he willed, and which the consciences of his countrymen must have internally told them was according to the letter and spirit of the laws of their King and their God. He resided several days in Jerusalem, and performed miracles which are not recorded. These had their natural and necessary effect. Many, we are told, believed on him—believed, probably, credulously and wonderingly, that he was some mighty messenger sent from God for their guidance and deliverance; but from the peculiar expression of John, that “Christ knew what was in man, and did not commit himself to them,” we are fully entitled to conclude that their faith was not much more than that staring wonder which is called forth of necessity by a display of supernatural power and divine wisdom, but which does not descend into the heart as a regenerating principle, which constrains and compels all the mind, and all the affections, and all the willing and delighted obedience.

But the awe and wonder produced by his miracles, by his assumption of unchallenged power, and by his doctrines, brought some to inquire. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, who had seen his doings, and heard his doctrines, came to him under the secret covert of the night to satisfy himself personally, and more particularly, about this new authority, this all-commanding doctrine. He had come to the unavoidable conclusion that God was with the teacher, and that his doctrine must be of God, since he had the power of working such miracles. It was very natural, therefore, that he should take the obvious means of getting the questions that forcibly arose and pressed themselves on his mind satisfactorily answered. But the fear of the condemnation of the great and the popular, or of the dreaded sarcasm of their laugh, made him resolve to come to the New Teacher when no eye saw him. It is not said without good reason immediately before, that Jesus knew all men. He saw the sincerity of the heart, and timid honesty of the motives, that brought Nicodemus to him;—he entered at once into the spiritual nature of that doctrine which he came to propound, of that kingdom which he was now to establish according to the predictions of the ancient prophets, and in fulfilment of the hopes of such men as this upright ruler and sincere inquirer. He told him that no man could see in what he did or taught the principles of the divine kingdom, unless he was regenerated in heart and mind; that the hopes of the Jews were carnal and earthly; that his doctrine and the principles of his kingdom were in perfect accordance with the works of God in the natural world; but that, like the invisible power of the wind, the mode of their operation was not perceived by the observation of the outward and material senses. This was new and mysterious doctrine to one who entertained the fond hopes of temporal liberty and earthly glory under the Messiah; and the Teacher of the only truth, and the sole Redeemer of the captive Israel, pressed upon his mind that the expectations of the Jews were false and



unfounded; that he alone who came down from heaven could inform men of the will and the law of their God; that the evidence which he gave of his having come upon earth for the great purpose of delivering mankind from error, and leading them into the truths of heaven, was sufficient to authorize the belief of all who saw his works, and listened to his doctrines. Even so early in his ministrations, he made it known to this candid, though cautious inquirer, that in the ancient dispensation of Moses, hints were given of the nature of his victorious conquest—as the serpent in the wilderness sent forth a healing virtue to all who looked to it in faith, so should the Son of God, when raised in a similar manner, give the principle of everlasting life to all who looked to him in similar faith. This was high doctrine, and hard of comprehension to a Pharisee and a Jew, with all the belief of his sect, and many, or all, of the prejudices of his nation. But the Teacher of truth, who communicated to men the principles of his religion, as he knew their minds were prepared to receive them, clearly saw the character of Nicodemus, and directed his instructions accordingly. We refer to the very striking account of that interview as one of the many illustrations of the manner in which he gained converts to the belief of the doctrines which he came to preach to the unbelieving world. This ruler of the Jews—this master and teacher in Israel, understood not the very nature and full bearing of the spiritual truths now set before him, but he saw that the Teacher had the sanction of a divine commission—he felt that he had the power of a divine persuasion in setting before him the doctrines, in regard to which he was so anxious to be instructed. Henceforth Nicodemus was a believer in Jesus as the Messiah, though he did not relinquish, and was not asked to relinquish, the office of authority and influence which he held under the old dispensation, which was so corrupted and perverted by those who explained its doctrines and inculcated its precepts. He was anxiously desirous of seeing the truth—was made to see it dimly, and to understand the danger of shutting his eyes to its light; and though he could not yet understand the nature or the universality of the application of that work of redemption which was to draw all men to the Saviour, yet he became a sincere, though secret and timid, believer in Christ.

After this public manifestation of his power and of the character of his doctrines, at the most solemn of all the festivals of the nation, Jesus left the capital of Judea, but preached and baptized converts to his doctrines in the neighbourhood. He had not yet made fully known to any the full purport of his great mission and undertaking, because the people were prepared neither to understand nor receive it. The strange anomaly was exhibited to the Jews of two divinely-commissioned teachers, acting, as it appeared to them, independently of each other, and with different objects in view. John was still preaching the doctrine of repentance, and baptizing his converts into the hope of a deliverer whom he had mysteriously pointed out. That individual of whom he had spoken in such high terms, and who had received such divine attestation, was also calling to repentance, and announcing the approach of the heavenly reign of deliverance. This naturally excited inquiry among the disciples of John, and the Jews who announced to him that Jesus had assumed his office of preaching and baptizing, and that multitudes were flocking to him. Instead of showing any jealousy or envy, John testified the highest joy at the intelligence, and intimated plainly that this was an announcement that his office of a preparatory harbinger and warning voice was now nearly executed and coming to its close; that the warning light of the morning star

would wane and vanish when the great source of his borrowed light arose, and shed the unborrowed splendour of his living light upon the awakening world.

Such events and such claims to a high commission, in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, could not fail to rouse the anxious attention of the ruling and zealous sect of the Pharisees. They knew little or nothing of his doctrines, they might not understand the purport of his miracles, but the multitudes who followed him raised their envy, and the lowly appearance in which he came prejudiced them against receiving him as the Messiah for whom they looked. To avoid the hostile intention, which it is intimated they entertained against him, Jesus left Judea for the time, and retired towards Galilee. To go thither he had to pass through the country of Samaria. The festival of the passover was past a considerable time, the scorching heat of summer was come, he and his disciples had travelled far, the evening was at hand, and the faintness of humanity overtook the man of sorrow,—he was hungry and thirsty. They had reached the well of Jacob in the neighbourhood of Sychar, and Jesus sent his disciples to buy food at the village. While he rested by the side of the well, a Samaritan woman came to draw water, of whom he asked a drink. This request surprised one who observed that he was a Jew, and knew the deadly antipathy which they entertained against the Samaritans.* Our Saviour, the divine teacher of truth, without distinction of persons, entered into conversation with her, and while he told her of the error of the Samaritan belief, showed that he was possessed of a prophetic and divine knowledge, led her thoughts above the local prejudices of the imagined sanctity of particular places, and told her that the time was now come, when all temporary distinctions of the preparatory system were about to be removed—when all who worshipped God in the sincerity and truth of a spiritual devotion would be equally accepted. This was new doctrine to one who was naturally as bigoted as the Jews; but he gave full proof that he had a knowledge of her life and character, which convinced her that he was a prophet; and, finally, told her plainly that he was the Christ whom the Samaritans, as well as the Jews, expected to teach them all things. The result was, that he gained her belief, and through her declaration, that he had told her all the secret acts of her life, he was requested

* All readers of the Scriptures are fully aware of the deadly hatred which subsisted between the Jews and the Samaritans, but all are not aware of the causes which gave rise to that hostile feeling. The Samaritans were not originally Jews, but mixed tribes of heathens, introduced at various times by Shalman-ezer and Ezzarhadon, after the final desolation and removal of the ten tribes. After the Babylonish captivity of the more faithful two tribes, they had caused great annoyance to the restored Jews, and under Sannballat and his son-in-law, the apostate priest Manases, they had erected a temple on Mount Gerizim, and, contrary to the express law of Moses, had performed all the rites of the Jewish worship there. Not only this, but under the exterminating persecution of Antiochus, the Syrian successor of Alexander, they had renounced the worship of the Jewish ritual, and had dedicated their temple to the Grecian Jupiter, and shown their zeal for the religion of the desolator, in opposition to the bold, and zealous, and successful Maccabees. Thenceforth there was the bitterest antipathy between them and the Jews. We learn from Josephus, that a short time before—only a few days—this last visit of Christ to the polluted temple, the Samaritans, on the eve of the paschal feast, had defiled the sacred precincts, by scattering dead men's bones over it. The Jews naturally, therefore, would have no friendly intercourse with that tribe; to eat bread with a Samaritan, according to them, was as great a pollution as to eat swine's flesh. The author of Ecclesiasticus expresses the national feeling, when, in one of the most sacred treatises, he gives expression to this sentiment, "Two nations my soul hateth, the Samaritans and the Philistines." One of the bitterest reproaches which the Jews thought they could cast against our Saviour derived its sting from the same feeling, "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil," as if these two expressions were synonymous.

by the inhabitants of the hated Sychar—"the drunkards of Ephraim," as the Jews called them, to visit their town, and give them the instructions which he proclaimed. He stopped two days in their city, and preached the doctrine of the universal salvation of his kingdom with such persuasive power, that the Samaritans expressed their belief that he was indeed the Christ whom they expected, the Saviour of the world. Their prejudices, however erroneous, were not so fiercely bigoted as those of the Jews, and with them he was much more explicit than he had hitherto been to the peculiarly chosen people of the ancient covenant. From the readiness of belief which he found among the hated and erroneous Samaritans, he took occasion to give encouragement to his disciples as to the approaching success which they were to meet: "Say not ye, there are four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest."*

But his present object was rather to remove prejudices, to excite real and obvious hopes, to spread far and wide the principles of the truth, by going from place to place, than by remaining stationary in one locality, and collecting around him an admiring and devoted multitude, who were not yet, and could not yet be, prepared to understand the true spiritual nature of that kingdom which he was to establish. He therefore proceeded on his way to Galilee, whither, we are told by Luke, he went in the "power of the Spirit." He went not yet to Nazareth, the place of his former abode and lowly life, for he knew the weak and unreasonable prejudices of the human heart, and that a prophet, coming with such claims among his former acquaintances, would meet with neither candid hearing, nor honour, nor success. But he traversed the region of Galilee, preached John's doctrine of repentance in the synagogues, announced that the predicted time was fulfilled, and that the spiritual reign of God was at hand. He wrought many miracles, most of which are not recorded, "healing all manner of sickness and disease among the people." By the shores of the lake of Galilee, through all her cities and villages, in her synagogues, on the Sabbath-days, and among her more lonely mountains, he made known to all that he came with a power far superior to that of their rulers and rabbis, pointed out the gross errors of their doctrine, condemned with strongest censure the unholiness of their lives, and produced a universal belief that God had again visited his people, and that the spirit of prophecy was revived among them. It was from among the poor and illiterate fishermen of the Galilean lake that he called the first selected disciples to follow him, and forsake their worldly avocations. Peter and Andrew, and James and John, had no other means of making a livelihood than their nets, and their boats, but the compelling majesty of that invitation induced them at once to leave all that they possessed, and to follow him. While he was at Cana, a nobleman of Capernaum applied to him to come and heal his son, who was at the point of death. The individual was possessed of belief, but only of that kind apparently excited by the report of the miracles which he heard Christ had performed. While he reproved the idle principle which would rest faith only in the performance of a multitude of these signs and wonders, adapting his reproof to some

* The Jewish harvest commenced about the passover—generally the middle of April, and continued unto the months of May and June. It has been concluded, therefore, that this journey took place about the middle, or toward the end of December, soon after the seed-time. The local allusions give force and illustration to all our Divine Teacher's remarks, but as the Evangelists were not minutely particular in fixing or noting dates, we need not expend criticism on a subject which does not throw great light upon the view we take of his discourses.

mental condition which he saw the ruler had laid down for himself, he exerted his divine power to encourage the weak faith of the applicant. Though he would not go with one whose limited faith had set the conditions for himself, he told him to depart, and that he would find his son restored to health. He believed and returned, and found that the fever had left his son at the moment when, at a great distance, the healing word of power and of comfort was uttered. The circumstances were so striking, that he was thenceforth a believer in the divine mission of Jesus.

Shortly after this he gave a proof of a very different kind, that he was indeed a preacher of heavenly truth. Hitherto he had not visited his native city, Nazareth, since he had taken upon him the character of a public teacher and reformer of the religious belief of his countrymen, and a worker of miracles. The men of Nazareth had heard of his fame in Judea and Galilee, and apparently expected that they also should be favoured with a display of his power. In honour of the solemn and sacred observances of the religion of his countrymen, he entered their synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and being requested by the rulers to read and expound the passage which was to be read for the instruction of the people, he complied.* Having not, as they knew, received a learned education, they might think that this request would be a test of his professions. He translated and explained the glorious promises and blessings of the Messiah's reign with such clearness and eloquent force of conviction, that all were astonished at the power of the teacher, and the evident truth of his doctrine. But when he began to apply the fulfilment in his own person of this great jubilee year of deliverance and restoration, and to upbraid them with their unbelief, and mean ideas of the doctrines which he taught, and the selfish and worldly expectations of their carnal minds, they became enraged at what they thought the contempt and presumption of the humble and unlearned carpenter. From some expressions in his address, which are recorded by Luke, it would seem that they expected he would perform, for their gratification, some such miracle as he had done at Cana, and at Capernaum. But when they found themselves classed with the heathen Syrian captain, Naaman, and the Gentile widow of Sarepta, in the days of Elijah, their self-righteous pride was converted into fury, and they rushed upon him to cast him over the rocks of the hill on which their town stood. He avoided their rage by some exertion of that divine power of which he was possessed—he retired to Capernaum, and it does not appear that he ever afterwards, except once, visited the unbelieving and ungrateful town of his nativity.

The ministry of his forerunner John was now come to an end. He had incurred the displeasure of the sensual and vindictive Herod, whom he had severely rebuked for living in open adultery with the wife of his brother Philip. That dissolute and unprincipled woman had urged her weak and selfish paramour, who otherwise had been inclined to show much outward respect to the strict and self-denying preacher of repentance and righteousness, and he had seized and imprisoned him. Our

* Most of our readers know that the synagogue service was instituted by Ezra and Nehemiah after the return from the Captivity. In that long period of two generations the people had lost the use of the ancient Hebrew, in which almost all the books of the Old Testament were composed, and this custom was instituted not only to read, but also to translate and expound, the law and the prophets. At first they confined this to the books of Moses, which were so divided as to be read through in one year, but afterwards they added also the prophetic books, to be read along with the other. Hence the roll of the sacred volume opened at the lxi. chap. 1st verse, of the Prophecy of Isaiah, as the passage of the day. From the order in which it is known, or supposed that the books were read, it has been attempted to fix this occurrence to the second or third Sabbath of September; but the question is one of little practical importance.

divine Saviour and teacher, therefore, now entered upon a more laborious and extensive field. His chief residence was henceforth at Capernaum, a city on the north side of the lake of Genesareth, or Tiberias, but from this he visited all the neighbouring country of Galilee, commencing with the proclamation of John, "repentance and preparation" for the Gospel of the kingdom of peace and holiness. His fame went throughout all that very populous country, and filled the whole of Syria with the belief that a prophet, resistless in the commanding eloquence and power of his doctrine, and mighty in the working of miracles, had risen to enlighten and raise the hopes of the Israelites. None of the Evangelists give, or could possibly give, an account of all the miracles which he wrought, or report all the discourses with which he daily, and all day long, instructed the multitudes which flocked to him. We are informed that they brought to him all manner of sick and diseased people, those who were possessed with unclean spirits, lunatics, and such as were tormented with the palsy, and he healed them all. Capernaum was the centre from which all his journeys diverged, because it was located by a lake whose shores were crowded with many cities—because it was there that most of the disciples whom he had called to follow him occasionally resided, and gained their living—and because, in the believing ruler, whose son he had restored from the gates of death, he would have a zealous and influential protector and friend. It was here where the first miracle, by which he cast out an evil spirit from one possessed, was performed. For a time, at least, he seems to have confined his Sabbath ministrations to Capernaum, and preached in their synagogue, assuming a high authority, and asserting and establishing it in a way to which the scribes and ordinary teachers of the law had laid no claim. The prince of the spirits of darkness, who had been baffled in the wilderness, seems to have rallied his forces, to have collected his rebellious legions, and to have been permitted to use every effort and device to defeat the great object of Him who had come as a mighty conqueror to dispossess him of his usurped power over the souls and bodies of men. Our limits do not permit us to enter upon the many questions which have been raised in regard to the demoniacal possession mentioned in the Gospels—whether it had been permitted previously among the Jewish and the Gentile nations—whether it was as common an occurrence in the days of old as it seems to have been then—whether the phenomenon cannot be explained away, as some endeavour to do, by considering it a peculiar form of bodily or mental disease, to which the Jews commonly gave this name, and which the Evangelists continued to characterize in the usual language of their countrymen. It cannot admit of a doubt that they do represent the demoniacs as really possessed by the personal presence of evil spirits—neither do we think it can be fairly questioned that they believed in the reality of that possession. The language which those evil spirits uttered cannot, in the exercise of common sense, be attributed as the natural language of the individuals possessed, were it really a disease. The evil spirits address Christ as their enemy, request him to depart from them, and not to torment them before their time, confess his mighty power, and declare, with a knowledge and belief natural and easily understood in their case, but which is wholly incomprehensible on the supposition that those whom the Gospels represent as under the influence of the devil, were simply fatuous, or lunatic: "I know thee," say they, "who thou art, the Holy One of God." We can easily conceive how all this was natural in the subjects and evil instruments of him who knew the Scripture, and, to a certain extent, was acquainted with the doings of the spiritual and invisible world; but we cannot understand how such knowledge

could be possessed, and such sentiments uttered, by the most miserable and most ignorant of the human race. We need not wonder that these agents of Satan should lead their helpless and wretched victims into the holy precincts of the synagogue, or into the presence of Him whom they knew to possess the power of expelling and punishing them. Their chief, in the days of old, was permitted, and had the presumption to present himself with the angels of light, before the throne of the Father of spirits, and was allowed, to his discomfiture, to exercise his ungovernable cruelty on the person, and family, and property, of the patriarch of Uz. It was natural, on the present infinitely more important occasion, to him, that he should gather together, from all regions of the air and of darkness, the many multitudes of his ready instruments—that he should use all his own wiles to discover the character of one who had already proved a too powerful antagonist—that he should, reckless of human sufferings, and of the consequences to himself, exert to the utmost, and to the last, all his might to defeat his declared conqueror. And it is not wonderful that all his deepest wiles should turn out folly—that all his plots should recoil in blacker disappointment and deeper vengeance upon his own head. The narrow land of Judea was the scene of the great and final contest between good and evil, fought in the presence of the spiritual intelligence of the universe; and it was clearly one of the conditions of that contest that the prince of darkness should have all the advantages which he could desire, to retain under his dominion that world, and that sinful race, whom he had seduced to himself. In Capernaum, in the synagogue, the first recorded instance of this confession of the evil spirit from the mouth of the person possessed took place. We can see no motive that such a spirit, on such a design as we have supposed probable, could have for making known his presence, or uttering the confession and request which he did. It is to be supposed that he was under a constraining compulsion, which he could not resist, to act as he did. It was a most important testimony to the Jews, in regard to the character of the terrible adversary who was among them, and to the character of Him who had come to destroy all the works of the devil. Jesus commanded him to be silent, and to come out of the man. Crying with the loud voice of disappointment and agony, tearing the man and casting him down, he departed out of his usurped residence, and created amazement among the people in regard to the nature of the power of that individual, who, with a word, could make the spirits of evil give instant obedience.

It was here also, about this time, when he had called Peter and his companions to leave their avocations, and follow him in the higher duty of being fishers of men, that he gave them a proof that he had the means of compensating them for their apparent loss of time, and forsaking of their worldly employment. They had fished unsuccessfully in the lake all night, and had given up their labour in despair; but at the request of Him, of whose knowledge and power they had observed so many proofs, they pulled out their boat, and cast their net at a spot which he indicated, and inclosed fishes in such numbers and of such a description, as proved to them, experienced in these matters, that the draught was altogether miraculous. This was an argument which could not fail to come home to the bosoms of fishermen, and carried stronger conviction to the ardent mind of Peter than any other putting forth of the power of Jesus which he had hitherto witnessed. In all his arguments and illustrations of his doctrines, as well as in all his acts, He that knew the minds and characters of all men, adapted himself, as far as possible, to the character and circumstances of those whose conviction he intended to gain. With a master possessed of such power, they must have seen that, though they left all and followed

him, they could not be greatly in want, when He could command the fishes of the lake to come to their net.*

In his journeys throughout the country of Galilee, and in his preaching the doctrines of his heavenly truth, and working miracles, he was only occasionally accompanied by such of his disciples as he called for that purpose. But now, he designed to select a certain number of witnesses to accompany him constantly—to be always with him. He retired to a mountain apart, and called them to follow him thither. He ordained twelve to this high office, upon whom he bestowed miraculous powers, and inspired them with such a knowledge of the doctrines which they were to teach, that they might go forth without his presence, and preach where he had not been, and prepare for his coming. The number was an intimation that they were to gather together the scattered remnant of the twelve tribes, and their office, in the meantime, was to proclaim the truth to those multitudes who now thronged from all quarters to the preaching of Christ. The duty of instructing them, which was incumbent on the scribes and ordained teachers, had been totally neglected, and our Saviour compassionated them as sheep wandering without a shepherd.†

Having thus chosen the lowly ministers of his unambitious and spiritual kingdom, he took an early opportunity of expounding to the congregated multitudes what were the laws and principles of his government—what were the truths which he taught, the precepts which he inculcated, and the object at which he aimed. He went up to a high mountain, and, sitting down according to the custom of the East, called his disciples and the multitude about him, and delivered a summary of the virtues and graces which the doctrines he taught inculcated, and were calculated to inspire. It is not our intention to transcribe or expound the particulars of that divine exposition of the doctrines of Christianity, without feeling the principles of which, and without practising the duties enjoined, no one can be a Christian. As the Jewish teachers of all sects had grossly perverted the doctrines of the religion given by God of old to their fathers by Moses, so had they more grossly still corrupted its commanded duties. They were fanatically zealous against all alien idolatry, and would have compassed sea and land to make proselytes to their own sects; but they had thrown aside the spirit of the law—the practice of justice and mercy, and made all obedience consist in the superstitious and scrupulous observance of the outward ceremonies of their religion. Their pretended holiness was only spiritual pride and presumptuous vanity—their pretended deeds of charity were only a cheap and selfish hunting after the applause of men, while they were in reality avaricious and rapacious, destitute altogether of the spirit of charity, merciless and vindictive. The standard of their morality was to obtain the applause of men, and provided they could attain this, they cared not for the inward purity of heart, and piety of disposition. Of course they set it down as a maxim, that it was not the secret conception, thought, desire, or complacent indulgence in the ima-

* There is another miraculous draught of fishes from the same lake, and by the same individuals, mentioned by John, but it was at a very different period of our Lord's ministry, and in totally different circumstances, and the two are not to be confounded.

† We may mention, that the writers of Harmonies differ considerably in the order of arrangement of the different events recorded by the four Evangelists. Macknight places the calling of the Apostles after the sermon upon the Mount, the calling of Matthew, and some other miracles mentioned. It is a matter of no great consequence, but we think that it comes in naturally here, and that Matthew's name was added to the Apostolic college after his conversion, and the final and full number given from the beginning.

gination, of any sin or crime, that was wrong, but only the open commission of the outward act before the world ;—that is, they threw out of view altogether the omniscient eye of God, and regard to his approbation. The very natural consequence of such a doctrine was, that if they could indulge their sensual inclinations secretly, they had no step in their morality to restrain them but fear of detection—if they were fair without, it was only the ornament of the gorgeous tomb, which was full of dead men's bones and all impurity. We need not here mention the moral systems of the heathen philosophers, which, to a considerable extent, had been adopted by the Jewish sects. Ultimate good—the greatest happiness—was the object of all their speculations ; but all of them, to an almost incredible extent, differed as to the means of reaching it. Wealth, power, sensual pleasure, fame, glory among men, or a proud and contemptuous indifference to every other motive or principle but the stern and unbending pursuit of their own will, and an obstinate struggle against a fate which they believed resistless, were the objects of their pursuit in search of happiness— the principles of their contradictory and inconsistent moral systems. Neither Jew nor Gentile had any thing but a vague and uncertain prospect beyond time and the world ; at least the principles upon which they acted led to the conclusion, that they would have been perfectly satisfied with the happiness which they thought this world capable of giving. Compare with all these the moral system of the Gospel of peace and holiness. Christ also sets down happiness as the object of pursuit to every rational and moral creature ; but how was it to be obtained ? Not by pride, the cause of the fall of angels and men, but by humility and poverty of spirit—not by mirth, and the riotous gaiety and licentiousness of carnal indulgence, but by mourning over our sins, and lamenting the corruption of our nature—not by indulging the angry passions of contention and revenge, but by the meekness of a mild and gentle spirit which turns away wrath, which leads to patient acquiescence in the will of God—not by an anxious desire for the pleasures or wealth, the glory or power of the world, but by a hungering and thirsting after the righteousness and holiness of heaven—not by the exercise of resentment of injuries—not by cruelty and revenge, but by the exercise of mercy, compassion, and beneficence—not by the gratification of all the desires of the heart or of the eye, but by purity of heart, and mortification of the evil passions, by love to the practice of a holy obedience for its own sake, independently of any mercenary reward—not by the glory of war, or the loud fame of bloody victories, but by the promotion of peace and harmony, and good-will among men—not in the admiration and applause of the men of this world, but often in their reproach, and hatred, and persecution. These are the virtues and precepts of the kingdom of Christ—all opposed to the spirit of this world's practice, as well as to its morality. And the happiness which these graces produce, and which God has assigned to them as their blessing and reward, is altogether different from, but infinitely higher, than any which the men of this world seek, or which it can bestow. They shall inherit the kingdom of God and be comforted,—they shall inherit the earth—they shall enjoy its riches, and be filled with pleasures which the sinful cannot taste nor imagine—they shall obtain the mercy of God, and be called His children ; and should they be persecuted here, as the prophets were of old, they shall be rewarded with the exceeding happiness of heaven. Laying down these things as the fundamental principles of his gospel, he proceeds to tell his disciples that they are to exhibit them in their conduct ; he tells them that he came not to destroy the law, or remove its obligation, but to fulfil and explain it in its spirit and perfection. He points out

many abuses of the Pharisees in regard to the venial nature, as they taught, of sensual desires, of prevaricating in giving of slight oaths, in the spirit of revenge, and exposes the hypocrisy and selfishness of their ostentatious alms, and public prayers and fasting. He cautions them against an over-anxious care for the world, against hasty judgment of others—shows them the inconsistency of the service of God, and a devotion to the things of time—the difference between merely hearing and assenting to the truth, and being firmly convinced of it, and standing in its principles against all the assaults and temptations of the world.

This heavenly discourse, the principal topics of which, of course, were often repeated and inculcated on various occasions, infinitely surpasses all human morality which was ever taught or recorded. It goes at once to the root of the corruption of human nature, points to the fountain-head of sin in the evil heart, and teaches that, unless this is purified, all other ceremonial compliances and outward acts of apparent obedience are hypocritical and vain. The Teacher of the law of God, indeed, drew a picture of perfect obedience, which none of the fallen and sinful race of Adam can copy, and set a standard of perfect obedience which none of them can reach. But far as he had gone before all teachers who ever propounded a system of morality, or explained, by the unaided powers of obscured reason, and the bias of a sinful heart, the revealed doctrines of the old dispensation, still it was only a step, and a necessary step, in the progress of his great work of making known the doctrine of salvation to the world, and working out that salvation in our nature, and for our sake. It behoved him first to set before man plainly and fully the true condition under which he was placed, the broad and strict law of righteousness which he was bound to fulfil, before he set before him the all-sufficient remedy which he was about to provide. It is perfectly evident, from the whole of that spiritual and convincing demonstration, that the superinducing of the remedy does not abrogate the law of perfect righteousness, nor absolve man in the slightest from its obligation, but only confirms and enlarges its sanction, by bestowing upon him new knowledge and new power, and a new spirit for a perfect obedience. They err miserably and ruinously, who suppose that Christ came to abolish the old burdensome ceremonial law of Sinai, for the purpose of establishing another which connived with more easy tolerance at the imperfections and transgressions of mankind. The final object of every rational creature must, as Christ takes for granted in the commencement of his discourse, be happiness in some abode of bliss and of rest. He shows that such happiness is not competent to any creature destitute of holiness—he describes the nature of that holiness, and the constituent parts of which it must be composed in such creatures as man; and in his after ministrations and future labours, and sufferings and conquest, he provides the means of obtaining that holiness to every one who will receive him and his work, as the author and true substance of effectual righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. In the work of the salvation of a sinful world, as in all the works of God, there is a most consistent and beautiful ascending gradation from beginning to end. Every part is beautiful and faultless in itself; but its perfect adaptation to the end intended cannot be seen nor felt, unless all the individual parts are viewed together, and used by every individual as the means of passing the otherwise impassable gulf, which separates the guilty creature from the Holy Creator and Governor. We do not wonder that the multitudes, who listened with deep attention on the solitary mountain side, and under the bright canopy of the spiritual heaven, to truths which had never been uttered in such

plainness and clearness before, should have been astonished at the doctrine of Him who spake as never man could speak. The scribes and Pharisees *should* have taught the same doctrines which he taught, since the delegated authority which from their office they possessed, was the same authority which he assumed, and which he bestowed. But these corrupt teachers had lost, or willingly thrown away, the key of the kingdom of heaven, which God had given them, and they could not open to the hungry and thirsty flocks which looked up to them, those treasures of heavenly truth which they had sinfully shut upon themselves. Their pretended traditions of the elders, instead of being the high and spiritual sense of the ancient revelation, were the gross perversions and carnal additaments of men, who knew not, and desired not to know, the Scriptures nor the power of God.

This spiritual and heavenly doctrine must have been unpalatable to the natural taste, to the vitiated and corrupted minds of the Jews. But it was delivered with a heart-compelling power, which called forth a responsive echo in the breasts of all who heard it; and, besides, it was spoken by one who showed every day, and every hour of the day, that he was possessed of the power of removing all the ills, and curing all the diseases, and relieving all the wants, which sinful humanity inherits.

As he came down from the mountain, a leper, who by the law of Moses was excommunicated from all intercourse with the rest of the people, came and kneeled to him, expressing his belief that Jesus could heal him if he chose. In such circumstances, the compassionate Saviour always exerted his power. With a word he removed the abhorred and dreaded disease, charged him to tell no man of the manner in which he had been cleansed, nor of the person who did it, but to go to the priest, and fulfil the injunctions of the ceremonial law. We might err in ascribing, at all times, motives to the actions or charges of one who was infinite in wisdom and goodness. On one occasion, he orders individuals, upon whom he has wrought miraculous cures, to go and publish what has been done to them—at another, he requests silence and the simple faith of a grateful heart. On the present occasion, we cannot err far in supposing that the request was the natural dictate of the faintness of exhausted strength on the part of Him who took to himself the whole sinless weaknesses of our fallen human nature. The Man of sorrows was liable to be oppressed, exhausted, wearied, like the rest of his brethren; and to us, such a desire, with such a motive attached, is one of the most deeply affecting proofs that the Son of God, who spoke the truths of heaven, and wielded at will all the powers and laws of nature, was still in body and in mind truly the Son of man. The over-zealous gratitude of the cleansed leper made him forget the charge—he “blazed abroad” the cure which the omnific word had in a moment wrought. The report of such a cure caused the congregation of such crowds, that Jesus was compelled to withdraw for a time from the oppressive labour, and from the habitual collection of multitudes, which at that time might have been politically dangerous.

But he did not execute this resolution till he had given further repeated proofs of his power and his goodness. A centurion, residing in Cavernaum, who had not been inattentive to the miracles and teaching of Christ, had a servant, whom he highly valued and loved, afflicted with palsy to an extent that threatened death. He made humble application to Christ that he would heal this servant, confessing, at the same time, his unworthiness, as a Gentile and a sinner, that the great Teacher should condescend to come under his roof. He expressed belief that if Christ would only utter the word the disease would depart. Jesus expressed his admiration at finding a faith in his miraculous power, so superior to that shown by the Jews, pos-

essed by a Roman soldier. He gave intimation of the design of God to bring the Gentiles from all quarters of the world into his heavenly kingdom, and informed the Jews that the faith of the heathen was as acceptable as their own, and that multitudes of them would, by such faith, enter into the glories of the heavenly paradise, while the children of Abraham, with all their privileges, should be excluded. To encourage and confirm that high belief, he granted the centurion's request, and announced to him that the servant was healed. The same day he restored to health the mother of Peter's wife, who lay sick of a fever. The fame of these miraculous cures spread through the city, and when sun was setting—which, with the Jews, was the end of the day of rest—they brought all the sick of the place to him, and the compassionate Physician laid his hands upon them, and healed them all. But the multitudes had now become troublesome, and, next morning early, Christ retired alone to the solitude of the desert, to devote some time to solemn meditation and secret prayer to his heavenly Father. The disciples and the inhabitants of Capernaum soon followed him, and requested that he would not depart from them. He made it known to them that he must preach the doctrines of his gospel in other cities also, and with his disciples went again through Galilee.

Of the particular miracles performed in this journey, and the doctrines taught, none of the Evangelists has preserved a detailed record. One, however, was too remarkable, in all its circumstances, not to be related. Christ had already shown himself possessed of a power which none before had ever exerted. He had cured all kinds of disease, but he had not shown that he held the keys of death, and could recall the vanished spirit, and raise to life. This he did in the case of the only son of a widow of Nain. He had so contrived this journey, that he met the sorrowful pomp of the funeral at the gates of the city. The loss of the forlorn mourner had excited the compassion of the inhabitants, and multitudes were accompanying her to give this respectful testimony of their sympathy in her bereavement. Christ topped the bier, and said to the senseless clay, "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise." The Lord of life was obeyed, the departed spirit heard the voice of heavenly power in the far land of its rest, and re-entered its former abode. Such a proof of divine power could not fail to strike with wonder all the spectators. They expressed their belief that God had visited his people in mercy, and that a great prophet had indeed risen among them. Had they judged correctly, they would have concluded that he who, though humble, and like the rest of men in outward appearance, was possessed of omnipotence, and exercised it of his own authority, and in his own name, was greatly exalted above all prophets. It was, indeed, a manifestation of God in the flesh, but their hopes were all worldly, and they could not rise to the right conception of the character of Him, the nature of whose work on earth, and the character of whose kingdom, could not be understood till he had finished that work, and established that kingdom. After this, he returned to the shores of the lake of Genesareth.

The curious multitudes again crowding him to behold his miracles, or to be benefited by them, he resolved to go to the other side of the lake, along with his disciples. One of the scribes offered to join the society of Christ, and follow him wherever he went. He, however, who knew the hearts of all men, detected some selfish motive, or observed that the offer arose from mere worldly hopes of temporal power or glory, for he gave the man no encouragement. He told him of the lowliness and destitution of his state, and we read not that the zeal or belief of the scribe was strong enough to encounter such self-denial. Others, who were more sincere disciples of the fellow-

ship, he bound to a decided profession, by commanding them to follow him, and leave behind all worldly cares and friendships. Having given this proof of his divine knowledge of human characters, he left the shore with his disciples, several other boats accompanying them. During the voyage across the lake a violent storm descended upon them, and their frail ship was in danger of being buried in the raging waves. Jesus, fatigued by the labours of the day, had retired to the after-part of the vessel to refresh the exhausted powers of his human nature by sleep. The disciples, terrified at the imminent danger, and forgetting the ever-watchful care and all-commanding power of their Master, awaked him with the despairing cry that they were about to perish. He that makes the winds and the lightning of heaven his messengers, rebuked the raging elements, and proved that he was their Lord—that all nature was under the control of his will. The stormy wind stopped in its destructive career, and the rolling waves sunk into motionless calm. This exercise of power, different from any which they had hitherto witnessed, filled the disciples with awe and astonishment. They were convinced, more than ever, that a divine power was possessed by Jesus. When the storm was hushed, they landed in the country of the Gadarenes, or Gergesenes, on the eastern side of the lake. Immediately on their coming out of the ship, they were met by two furious demoniacs, who had forsaken society, and lived among the tombs, which were cut out of the rocks. These miserable victims of the evil spirit, from their excessive violence, had been long a terror to the neighbourhood, and no doubt the intentions of the demons who possessed them were hostile on the present occasion. They were compelled, however, to acknowledge and yield to a power which they were anxious to resist and overthrow. The frantic demoniacs fell at his feet, and though they could have had no human means of knowing his person or character, addressed him as the Son of the Most High God, and beseeched him, by God, not to send them to the place prepared for their torment before the time decreed. To make known the misery from which he intended to deliver their helpless victims, he commanded them to tell their names and character. They told that their name was Legion, from the numbers who had made the bodies of the men their abode, and begged that he would permit them to enter a herd of swine feeding near the lake. The permission was given, the raving demoniacs were restored to the use of their faculties, and the two thousand swine rushed violently down the mountain side, and plunged into the waters. The motive of the evil spirit could be evil alone, and by destroying the property of the Gadarenes, they expected to excite their hostile prejudice against him who had been the cause of that loss. If the proprietors of the herd were Jews, they were justly punished for feeding and making profit of animals which God had declared unclean; if they were Gentiles, who kept them for their own use, or for the supply of the Roman armies, they were punished for setting a snare and stumbling-block before the Jews; or, it might be, to make a trial of their disposition, whether they would be more affected with the loss of their cattle, than with the miraculous recovery of their countrymen, and the preaching of the doctrines of the gospel. The people were terrified at the report of such power, and came unanimously to beseech Jesus to depart from them. He who seldom obtruded his doctrines upon those who were hardened and prejudiced against them, retired from their coast, and left them, for the time, in their wilful ignorance. He commanded the two men, however, whom he had released from the torments of the evil spirits, to remain and publish the work of miraculous power which had been performed upon them. "The world," says Bishop Hall on this miracle, "is well changed since Satan's first onset upon Christ. Then he could say, 'If thou be the Son of God;'

now, 'Jesus, the Son of the Most High God;' then, 'All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me;' now Satan falls down and worships Christ, prays to him, and says, I beseech thee, torment me not."

Jesus and his disciples returned across the lake to the Greater Galilee, where he was welcomed with more eagerness than he had been in the Gentile Galilee. He preached to them the doctrines of his kingdom as usual, and after some days went again to Capernaum, which Matthew calls "his own city." We are now come to another and very important stage of our Saviour's ministry. Hitherto he had been only casually noticed, and questioned, and opposed by the proud Pharisees, and scribes, and doctors of the law, when he visited Jerusalem. But now the fame of his miracles, the report of the doctrines which he preached, the power which he assumed, and the converts whom he was daily gaining, excited their jealous attention. They came from Jerusalem to watch his actions, and learn what was the nature of his doctrines. He soon gave them an opportunity, for it was speedily known in the town that he had returned to Peter's house, and multitudes came to listen to him, anxious, no doubt, to see how he would conduct himself before their authorized spiritual instructors, and answer their questions. He speedily and designedly gave them that opportunity to judge. A paralytic person, in a hopeless stage of the disease, was lowered through the roof, and placed before him on his helpless couch of pain. Instead of proceeding to cure him in the way he had been accustomed, he addressed him in language which the Lawgiver and Judge of man could alone use—"Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee." This to the learned Rabbis of the law seemed blasphemy; but Christ, to convince them by a practical process, which with them ought to have been perfectly satisfactory, commanded the helpless paralytic to rise, take up his bed, and walk. They believed that all afflictions were the immediate consequence and punishment of sin, and, therefore, according to their belief, the removal of the disease was tantamount to the forgiveness of sin. When they saw one, who discovered their secret thoughts, and answered them before they were uttered, claim an authority, and exercise a power, which they knew were competent to God alone, all their prejudices ought to have vanished, and sincere conviction of the divine commission and divine character of Jesus to have taken their place. They were all amazed, indeed, and their captious objections were silenced in terror, in presence of Him who showed that he was possessed of the attributes of omniscience and omnipotence. They confessed that they had seen strange things; but while the less bigoted multitude, along with the healed paralytic, glorified God, who had bestowed such power upon man, their evil consciences, and perverse reason, continued in a state of paralyzed stupidity, which was proof against all appeal and all demonstration.

From this time he had these self-righteous teachers as his constant hearers, not with the design of being instructed or convinced, but with the intention of raising captious objections to his conduct, and the principles which he taught. An instance of this occurred immediately after, on the calling of Matthew or Levi to be a disciple. He was of the class of publicans, or collectors of the revenue under the Roman Emperors. In former days, we learn from Cicero, that the publicans were selected from the "flower of the Roman knighthood, that they were the ornament of the state, and the security of the commonwealth," but in the days of Tiberius the case was greatly altered. We learn from the historians of the time, that they were mercenary, rapacious, and cruel to the most oppressive degree, especially in the provinces. They were, therefore, peculiarly odious, and nowhere more

detested than in Judea, where the people stood to the imaginary privilege of their nation, that they should pay no tribute to strangers. Such men as Matthew and Zaccheus were exceptions to such a character, but their justice and humanity could not exempt them from the national hatred and contempt. When, therefore, Christ accepted of an invitation given by Matthew to dine with a number of his friends of the same class, the Pharisees started it as a convincing objection, as they thought, against the purity of his character, as a teacher of truth and righteousness. It only showed their malice, and gave Christ an opportunity of triumphantly justifying his conduct. "Their objection," in the language of Jeremy Taylor, "turned to be his apology; for therefore he conversed with them, because they were sinners; and it was as if a physician should be reproved for having so much to do with sick persons; for therefore was he sent, not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance—to advance the reputation of mercy above the rites of sacrifice." The objection raised against him, in regard to his disciples not fasting like the Pharisees, and the disciples of John, was of the same character. They objected to John, because he was too abstemious, as they thought, and denied to the enjoyments of sense; they condemned Christ as a drunkard, and a friend of publicans and sinners, because, in his boundless benevolence and compassion, he condescended to associate with, and instruct and reclaim, the vilest and the most despised. He had come to bring the joyous tidings of redemption to the world, to espouse to himself a church as the elect bride of his love, and the days of the preparation for that holiest union were to be days, not of fasting and sorrow, but of joy and gladness. Such were the weak and captious objections at that time—groundless and absurd in themselves, but ominous of fiercer objections, and bolder calumnies, the envious cavils of wicked minds, which portended the approach of an open and more relentless warfare.

While thus engaged in the house of Matthew, Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, applied to him, in the utmost distress and humble supplication, to come and restore his daughter, who was at the point of death. He at once complied with the request, and went, accompanied by his disciples, and an expectant multitude. As he proceeded, a woman in the crowd, who had suffered under a cureless disease for twelve years, came behind and touched the hem of his garment, under the faith and hope that even that contact would cure her. The cure was instantly performed, and Jesus, who was aware of the act as well as of its motive, and the faith by which she was actuated, gave her comfort and encouragement. When he reached the house of Jairus, his young daughter was already dead, and the wailing voice of the mourners filled the abode. He encouraged his distressed supplicant to hope, and, putting all out of the room but the parents and three of his disciples, he took the lifeless damsel by the hand, and commanded her to arise. The omnipotent word was obeyed, and she was instantly restored to life and health. On his returning thence, two blind men followed him, crying for mercy upon their forlorn condition. He allowed them to follow him into the house, and tested them in regard to their belief in his power, and then granted their request, charging them, as he had done Jairus, not to make known the miracle which had been wrought. Such power, however, like the light of the sun, could not be concealed, and the fame of these stupendous miracles spread wider and wider. These works of omnipotent might and wide-spread compassion, however, although they clearly proved that he had a commission from the Father of mercies, had no persuasive power to gain the conviction of the proud and bigoted Pharisees. They represented him as an impos-

tor, and ascribed his works to the author of evil;—they said that he cast out devils through the prince of devils.

It is evident from the plain facts of the narrative, that the preaching of Jesus, sanctioned as it was by such miracles, in number and greatness far above all that had ever been performed by one in the form of human nature, began to produce a permanent conviction. Yet as a general or national impression, it was little more than a vague feeling of wonder or astonishment. The people could not resist the evidence of their own sight—they could not withstand the power with which he made the truth come home to their convicted conscience. But the scribes and Pharisees, whose attention had been necessarily called to these proceedings in Galilee, resisted all this, and their influence must have been felt by the great body of the people. Well might the Teacher of truth, who spoke with a power never before exhibited to man, express his wonder at their unbelief,—well might he express compassion for those sheep without a shepherd, who looked up and were not fed by those who were appointed their spiritual guardians and guides. He therefore sent forth his twelve chosen apostles to proclaim the immediate approach of the reign of the Messiah, and endowed them with the power of working all miracles. They were for the present to confine their ministry to the tribes of Israel, to avoid the Samaritans, and not to proclaim the doctrine of the Gospel to the Gentiles. Like their divine Master, they were to provide no superfluities for their journey, but to trust to the charity of those who gladly received their message. With such individuals they were to take up their residence, and upon such to bestow their blessing. He told them even thus early of the opposition, and rejection, and persecution they were to meet with—they were to go out as sheep in the midst of wolves, and, therefore, that all wisdom and meekness would be requisite. Though they should be brought before councils, and scourged in synagogues, and placed as criminals before the tribunals of kings and governors, they should not be terrified nor discouraged,—that he who sustained the universe in its motions, and watched over the life of the lowliest of the irrational animals, had their life in his watchful care, and that nothing should hurt them. With this commission they went forth, and, under the immediate direction and earthly presence of their divine Master, prepared themselves for the work of converting the world, when his undertaking should be accomplished, and his labours at an end.

All this time John the Baptist had been languishing in prison, and his ardent and zealous spirit seems to have wearied of the unimproved days that were passing hopelessly over his solitary cell. He was not so rigorously immured, however, but that his disciples had access to inform him of all the mighty deeds of Jesus. He evidently entertained the hope that his labours and life of usefulness were not over, and that he who could raise the dead with a word would interfere to open his prison doors. In this expectation he sent two of his disciples to Jesus with a question which plainly indicated irritation and impatience of mind: "Art thou He that should come, or are we to look for another?" He who had given John his commission, and assigned him his work, understood the nature of these offended feelings of an ardent mind which had dictated such a message. He performed, in presence of the messengers, a number of miracles, and told them to relate to the Baptist what they heard and saw, along with this compassionate reproof of his impatient spirit, "Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me." But after the departure of the Baptist's messengers, lest the people should form a wrong estimate of his character, he described him in his true colours—as above all the prophets in

honour; predicted by the greatest; invincible in courage; denied to all the luxuries of life; the immediate forerunner of the great object of all the prophets; the first who announced the entrance into the kingdom of truth of the Gentiles and other sinners who repent. Christ then clearly declared that the preparatory dispensation of Moses was coming to a close, and pronounced a severe condemnation upon those perverse individuals who would listen neither to the doctrines of John, who had come to them in all the stern austerity of the ancient prophets, nor to his, who conversed with the plainest familiarity and gentleness with all, and inculcated the doctrines of heavenly truth, while he mixed with them in their ordinary occupations and social enjoyments. After uttering this severe reproof against the self-righteous Pharisees, who were so conceited of their own imaginary learning and wisdom, he pronounced a still severer condemnation upon those cities around the lake of Genesareth which had been so particularly favoured with his personal ministry, and with so many demonstrations of his power and goodness. He told them it would be more tolerable for the wicked Cities of the Plain, and for the most abandoned of the Gentile nations, at the day of final retribution, than for those who had continued unbelieving and impenitent under the blessing of such privileges. He who knew all things, was aware of the inveterate bigotry of the rulers and priests, of the Pharisees and scribes, and that they set it down as one of the strongest objections against his commission and his doctrine, that they had only been received in general by the poor and illiterate, by the detested publican and abandoned sinner. He thanked God, who, in his wisdom, had concealed the truth of his doctrine from men who boasted of the learning and wisdom of this world, and rejected the counsel of God against themselves, while he had revealed it to the poor and unlearned—to those who were ignorant as babes of the pretended wisdom and speculative dogmas of the proud rabbis of Israel. Though it seemed a fatal objection then—a stumbling-block to the Jews, and the foolishness of barbarous and ignorant men to the Greeks—he knew that the very weakness of the human instruments whom he chose to triumph over the pride and power of worldly dignity and worldly wisdom, in its noonday glory, would prove it, by the highest and clearest demonstration of heaven, to be in reality the power of God, and the wisdom of God. He concluded by inviting all to come unto him who felt the galling yoke of sin, the slavery and tyranny of the world, and assuring them that they should find liberty and rest.

It is most instructive to observe the different effects produced upon different minds, and the various degrees of impression, even upon sincere minds, by the same truth. Simon, a Pharisee of Capernaum, as is supposed, had listened to the above discourse, and being converted, to a certain extent, asked Jesus to his house. While they sat at meat, a woman of the city, who had hitherto lived a sinful life, but had been convinced, by the preaching of Christ, came in and anointed his feet with ointment, bathed them with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. The strict Pharisee, who knew the woman's previous character, was offended at this conduct, and concluded internally that Jesus could be no prophet, else he would have driven such an individual with displeasure from his presence. Christ knew his secret thoughts, and, in the most striking and affecting manner, justified this testimony of affectionate gratitude on the part of a repentant sinner, who felt that her sins could be forgiven. He then assumed the character of a merciful judge, pronounced the sentence of forgiveness, and told that her faith had saved her.

After this Christ went up a second time to the Passover, accompanied, besides his disciples, by a number of pious women who had become converts to his doctrine,

and who henceforth supplied his wants out of their substance. It was on this visit that he restored to health and strength the impotent man who had lain so long at the Pool of Bethesda, and that the envious scribes and Pharisees took up against him the new objection of his being a Sabbath-breaker, because he restored to health on the day of sacred rest. They were so filled with furious indignation, that they determined to stone him to death. He justified his act by appealing to the spirit and intent of the law, and by the practice of his Father—making himself, in the opinion of the Jews, equal with God, which more enraged them against him as a blasphemer. He, however, now fully asserted his authority derived from the Father, the union which subsisted between them, the communion of the same dignity, the delegated power of judging the world, the manifestation of the character of the Godhead which was made by the Son, and reflected back in his works to the supreme Father. He rises higher, and proclaims that life and salvation is to be obtained through him alone, declares that the dead shall rise at his voice, and that he shall assign the different portions of the righteous and wicked hereafter. He finally confirms his mission and authority by an appeal to the testimony of John, whom they held to be a prophet, and of whom they had asked such a declaration—to the prophecies of Moses, which were in him fulfilled—to the testimony of God himself, who had spoken in these, and who had also spoken from heaven, in the hearing of the multitude to sanction his authority.

This imaginary profanation of the Sabbath was a ground of attack which they were determined to prosecute. On another Sabbath, while Christ and his disciples were walking through the corn-fields, the Pharisees observed them plucking the ears of corn, rubbing them in their hands, and eating them. This, according to them, was servile work, and a proof that he who allowed it was a breaker of the law of God. Christ taught them that the day of rest was granted as a high privilege to man, for the purpose of sacred rest, but that it was not intended to make man a slave to a positive institution, so as to debar him from the practice of works of necessity and mercy. He quoted to them the example of David, who was a prophet, and who, in a case of necessity, ate the sacred shew-bread, and gave it to his followers, which was lawful for the priests alone to eat; he also quoted them the example of their own priests, who killed the animals for sacrifice on that day, and assuming again the authority which he had claimed before, asserted that he who came to do a mightier work than the creation of the world, than the deliverance from Egypt, or the giving of the law, could, as the Lawgiver of the Jews, alter such institutions at his pleasure—"The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath."

Such reasons, sanctioned and confirmed by the exercise of such power, ought to have convinced the most prejudiced and bigoted; but with them they had the opposite effect. The next instance was the cure of a man with a withered hand in one of their synagogues in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. He knew that the malicious Pharisees were watching him, with the intention of raising an accusation such as would secure his death. He commenced the assault upon their murderous consciences, by asking, Whether it was lawful on such a day to do good, or to do evil—to save life, as he designed, or destroy it like them? Whether any of them would not lift out a sheep which had fallen into a ditch on the Sabbath-day? Such an appeal had no effect upon men who were determined to resist conviction, and it is remarkable that this is the only instance in which the compassionate Saviour is represented as testifying anger at the obstinate and perverse impenitence of man—"He looked round upon them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their

hearts." But though he showed his just displeasure against them, he proceeded to cure the withered hand, in the sight of all, by his word. Their rage at his open defiance of their power, and their unreasonable prejudices, blinded them to every other consideration—they went out, and joined in a confederacy with their bitter enemies, the Herodians, to cut him off.*

But Jesus had yet much to do before offering up the great sacrifice for sin; and, knowing their wicked intentions against him, he withdrew with his disciples and crossed the sea of Galilee, to a region where he was safe from their machinations. Here he had made friends of influence to protect him, if necessary, and the less prejudiced multitudes who crowded from all quarters to listen to his powerful doctrines, and to witness his stupendous miracles, acted as a check upon the murderous intentions of his bitter enemies. All the Jews had conceived false ideas of the Messiah's kingdom, and the disciples and apostles, along with the rest of their countrymen, still entertained the expectation that their Master was to assume temporal power, and come forth as a mighty conqueror. They seem at this time to have wished that he should exert that resistless power which they saw he possessed; but he explained to them the nature of the prophecy, and showed that his victories were to be those of truth and righteousness, that he should not "strive, nor cry, neither should men hear his voice in the streets"—that his kingdom and laws were not to be established by the destructive havoc of war, nor by the triumphant shout of victorious legions, but by the triumphs of peace, and the conquests of truth.

While he was at Capernaum, on this occasion, the implacable malice of the Pharisees raised a strange objection against him, at which they had once before hinted. He had cured a man under the possession of an evil spirit, who was blind and dumb. Such an amazing act of power, executed at the commanding word of Jesus raised the question, Whether he was not in truth the "Son of David," whom they were to expect as their Deliverer? But the Pharisees endeavoured to inculcate the strange doctrine that all these mighty miracles were the work of magic, and performed by the aid of Beelzebub, the prince of devils.† These insidious contender against convincing evidence had whispered this objection in secret, but Christ, who knew their malevolent machinations against the truth, exposed its self-evident absurdity, by appealing to all his actions, and all his doctrines and precepts, which were calculated to overthrow the dominion of the enemy of truth and of man, and putting it to themselves to explain how any kingdom could stand or be established by such dissensions, by such measures directly calculated to overthrow it. He presses the conclusion upon them, according to the principles of their own belief that his works were done by the Spirit of God, and a proof that God, by such messenger, was bringing the truth of his kingdom before them. In conclusion, he gave them the terrible warning, that though such blasphemous slanders against the Son of man might be forgiven upon repentance and acknowledgment of the truth yet that when the Holy Spirit had consummated the proof of his divine mission, at

* Considerable difference of opinion exists in regard to the character and tenets of this sect or party who are mentioned only thrice in the Gospels, and not at all by Josephus. It is probable that they were both a political and religious party, inclined to adopt the principles of allegiance to the Roman Emperor inculcated by Herod the Great, and his sons, as well as to conform with the idolatrous rites which he introduced into Judea, and to adopt Roman habits. It is supposed that they were chiefly composed of a sect of the Sadducees, the most loose and sceptical of the Jewish parties of that day.

† Beelzebub—the lord of flies—was the God of the Ekronites, and held in particular abomination the Jews, as being worshipped by their hated enemies, the Philistines.

pressed it upon their conviction, the obstinate shutting of their minds against that conviction should never be forgiven. He appealed again to his works and his doctrines as the sufficient and unanswerable proof of the divine authority under which he acted.

Conclusive as such a test was, his hardened and impenetrable foes treated it with indifference or contempt—they would have him to give them a sign from heaven, as if every miracle which he wrought was not an unquestionable sign from heaven, as he declared it to be. He refused to gratify their captious and unreasonable request, but intimated that they should have a sign in his death, and burial, and resurrection—the Son of man should repose three days in the bosom of the earth. Taking occasion, from the determined obstinacy of their unbelief, he paints the guilt of the nation in dark colours, and denounces the terrible retribution of judgment which they would bring upon themselves. The Ninevites had repented at the preaching of Jonah, and the Queen of the South had come to learn wisdom of Solomon, but they remained uninfluenced by the wisdom and miraculous works of One who was greater and wiser than all the ancient prophets. While thus engaged, his mother and other relations, probably fearing for his safety, amidst such spies and enemies, sent a message through the crowd that they wished to speak with him. He, whose love to mankind and devotion to his great work were infinitely greater than all partial affections, declared that those who listened with faith to his doctrines, and obeyed the will of his heavenly Father, were to Him as mother, and sister, and brother.

It does not appear that the bitter malice of the Pharisees had the effect of diverting the attention of the people, for vast multitudes still continued to crowd and listen to his doctrines. Leaving the house, and entering into a boat on the lake, he preached to the people who stood on the shore. In this discourse, which he made designedly parabolic, he set forth, in a great variety of striking similitudes, the character of the different hearers of the gospel, and the immensely different effects it produced upon their minds, and in the world. He brings in the whole of external nature to illustrate the nature and effects of spiritual truth—making the material works of God, the living creation, the operations and processes of nature, and the employments and pursuits of men, to throw light upon the word of revealed truth. This beautiful and graphic style was employed to avoid the captious cavils of his bigoted adversaries—to set the full truth before their eyes in connexion with their own character—to place the means of conviction before them in a manner the least obtrusive, and to leave them inexcusable, if they did not make the application to themselves. To his own disciples he explained every thing obscure, gradually, as their minds were prepared, initiating them into a knowledge of the mysteries of the whole truth. They had many prejudices still to be removed, and these he overcame, one after another, as the patient teacher gives line upon line, and precept upon precept.

His mother and brethren had again renewed their request to him during this discourse; and though he well knew the invincible prejudice of the people of Nazareth, he once more revisited the place where he had passed the years of his youth. He preached in their synagogue, and, by the eloquence and power of his language, excited their astonishment, knowing, as they did, that he had not possessed the means of obtaining a learned education. But, like all the rest of the Jews, they grossly misunderstood the nature of their own prophecies in regard to the Messiah, and looked for one who was to arise in outward glory and power to establish a temporal kingdom, and to raise his countrymen to the proudest elevation among the

empires of the world. They were, therefore, offended at seeing one whom they had known from his infancy following the lowly occupation of a carpenter, assume the character of a prophet, and of their promised Messiah. Having given them this second opportunity of listening to the doctrines of his heavenly kingdom, and finding their prejudices invincible, he left them, and visited the villages around, in execution of his divine mission.

In the mean time, Herod, at the vengeful instigation of his incestuous paramour,* had beheaded John the Baptist. The removal of the stern censor of his conduct might lull his guilty conscience to slumber in the enjoyment of his unnatural licentiousness; but the increasing fame of Jesus, and of his mighty deeds, reached his ears, and awaked his conscience to bitter remorse and tormenting fear. He expressed his belief, that the murdered Baptist was raised from the dead, and endowed with immortality, and the power of working mightiest miracles. It is supposed that Herod was of the Sadducean sect, and, according to their principles, believed neither in the doctrine of a future retribution, nor in the existence of the soul after death. But his alarmed conscience forced the real truth to flash across the habitual darkness of his guilty soul, and, notwithstanding the assiduous endeavours of his fawning courtiers, he evidently expected that the injured and murdered prophet was about to exert his divine power to punish his convicted murderer. But the merciful Saviour, however severely and plainly he published the recorded sentence of heaven against the guilty and impenitent, came not on earth to inflict it, but to beseech, with the most enduring patience, the most guilty to flee from the coming visitation of wrath, which he proclaimed with the infinite mercy of a Mediator, and not in the character of a vengeful judge. When the news of this sad event had brought back the disciples of Jesus to Capernaum, as also had sent those of John to Jesus, instead of exerting his mighty power in punishment of the guilty tyrant, he withdrew, along with his disciples, out of the territories of Herod into those of Philip. He took ship, to sail away from the multitudes who still thronged to his ministry. They retired into a solitary place near Bethsaida, that, by meditation and instruction at the mouth of their Master, they might be fitted for the spiritual labour before them, as well as refreshed from their fatigues. But the Passover was approaching, and people from all quarters were on their way to celebrate that festival at Jerusalem. His departure and the place of his destination, therefore, were soon discovered, and the people came in crowds from the surrounding country to them. Though Christ had sought the solitude of the desert for the very purpose of being refreshed by rest, yet he refused not the labour when it presented itself. He healed their sick, and continued to instruct them in the doctrines of his gospel, till the day began to decline. His disciples requested him to dismiss the multitude, that they might go to the villages around, and procure themselves food before night; but our compassionate Saviour told his disciples first to supply them with food. Such an order, in such a wilderness, might well strike them with surprise; but he soon let them understand that he was about to work a miracle. He asked them to produce their little store, which amounted only to five

* Herodias was grand-daughter of Herod the Great, by his son Aristobulus, and thus was niece both to Philip, whom she had deserted for the honour of a more splendid rank, and to Herod, with whom she was now living, guilty of the double crime of incest and adultery. Herod, from his awe of the Baptist's bold character, and fear of an insurrection of the people, would have saved him, but was entrapped by the implacable malice and cunning of Herodias, and John fell a martyr to the fearless discharge of his duty.

barley loaves and two small fishes—told them to arrange the multitude in companies on the mountain's side. He that fed the wandering millions of the Israelites in the desert with manna from heaven, and refreshed them with streams of water from the flinty rock, now covered a table for the hungry multitude out of what was barely sufficient for their own small company. He blessed the Lord, to whom the earth and the fulness of all its riches belong—broke the loaves and fishes into fragments—gave them to the disciples to distribute to each of the companies; and this scanty provision for a feast, under the creative blessing of Him who was the true bread of life, increased so amazingly as it passed from hand to hand, that the whole multitude of five thousand men, and perhaps as many women and children, all ate as much as they chose; and twelve baskets were filled with the fragments, each containing more than equal to the whole original supply. This was a creative work competent to Him alone whose laws the elements of nature obey, whose paths over the earth drop down fatness, who crowneth the year with his goodness.

Such a stupendous miracle, the benefits of which so many thousands had participated of at once, raised their carnal minds to a pitch of enthusiastic admiration which they had never reached before. They concluded, that one possessed of such power must indeed be their long-expected Messiah—that under such creative might they could never want, and need fear the attack of no enemy. But, instead of putting themselves implicitly under his direction, and acting according to his instructions, they proposed to lay violent hands upon him, and constrain him to proclaim himself a King. But He who left the infinite glory of the throne of heaven, and subjected himself to a life of sorrow, and privation, and suffering, for the joy and glory of being the spiritual King of a redeemed world, knew their intentions, as well as the ambitious wishes of his own disciples. He, therefore, sent the latter immediately to their boat, and, dismissing the multitudes, retired into the solitude of the mountain, to hold spiritual intercourse with his heavenly Father. They retired to their repose, to dream of the glories of an earthly monarchy, and the triumphant shouts of victorious armies over their proud and oppressive Roman tyrants, while He retired to sleepless sorrow, to muse upon the death which he was to suffer at their hands, the crown of thorns, the combination of kings and rulers against his life, and the insulting shouts of the heartless multitude at his expiring agonies, and to pray for forgiveness of their infatuated folly and impenetrable blindness.

Meanwhile, the disciples were struggling in the midst of the stormy waters of the lake, a violent contrary wind having arisen, and driven them from their point of destination, which was Bethsaida. The darkness of the night, and the violence of the storm, against which they could not bear up, might humble their ambitious thoughts, as it was probably designed to do. The morning watch, or three o'clock, had now come, and they had rowed, with painful difficulty, only about half way across the lake.* But the watchful eye of their compassionate Master saw them struggling in the midst of stormy darkness and impending danger, and came to their aid, walking in calmness over the heaving billows of the angry sea. They saw him, thought he was an evil spirit, and, with the superstitious belief of their country, cried out, thinking that it was the omen of certain destruction. But he calmed their fears, and convinced them that it was himself in reality. Peter, with his usual zeal, desirous

* John says, that they had rowed about five and twenty, or thirty furlongs, and we know that the breadth of the lake of Tiberias was 48 furlongs, or six miles.

of testifying his confidence in his divine Master's power, requested Jesus to bid him come to him across the water. The command was given, and the bold disciple stepped down confidently on the restless surface of the deep. But the raging of the storm and the tumbling waves shook his courage and his faith, and he began to sink. He cried out for aid, and his compassionate Master took hold of him, and led him safely into the ship, reproving his feeble faith. Again, as he had done on a former occasion, he rebuked the boisterous elements to a calm, and immediately brought the ship to land. The circumstances of this miracle seem to have amazed them more than all they had previously witnessed. They fell down at his feet, and confessed their belief that He was indeed the Son of God. We are not to suppose that this was the first time the conviction burst upon their mind that Jesus was indeed commissioned as a prophet from God. There is every evidence that they all believed this from the time that they became apostles. But it was by a very gradual and slow process that their minds opened up to a right conception of his character. This rapid repetition of most astonishing miracles gave them an elevated idea of Him, which they never before entertained, and they gave expression to their ardent feelings in this confession. They were yet far from understanding his character or his work aright, but He who does not "break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax," bore with the weakness of their faith, and the imperfection of their knowledge, fed them with the spiritual food of children, and poured instruction on their minds as they were able to receive it.

Arrived in the country of Genesareth, the multitudes crowded to him as usual with their sick, and so great were the numbers of these, that they requested they might be allowed even to touch the hem of his garment, remembering the cure that such contact had wrought in the case of the woman with the issue of blood. They probably entertained the fond superstition that virtue resided in the garment, yet our gracious Saviour granted their request, and every one who so touched him was healed. He returned to Capernaum; but the multitudes whom he had fed on the other side of the lake had waited all night in expectation of meeting him still in the mountain, and more ready to comply with their wishes. Finding that they were disappointed in their search and in their hopes, they also sailed across to the usual city of his residence, with the same expectations. Jesus, who knew the selfish nature of their attachment, and the mere worldly character of their hopes, and the false ground upon which they had raised these, took occasion, from the miracle of the increase of the loaves and fishes, to speak figuratively and at great length of the true character of that spiritual food which he was to give to man, and of the spiritual kingdom which he was to erect in the world. They still mistook him as speaking of some divine nourishment of a material kind, which the Messiah was to give them, and asked him, What they should do to establish that kingdom? He informed them, that the only thing required was to believe in Him who had come to them from heaven. This set them upon their foolish asking of signs, quoting Moses, who, they believed, had fed the millions of Israel in the wilderness with food from heaven. The infallible Teacher of truth pointed out their carnal mistake, and showed them that the spiritual bread which he provided for men was that which was to regale them, not with the sensual luxuries of material gratification, but to feed their souls with the doctrines of truth—that those who were fed upon the manna in the wilderness, as well as upon any other food of earth, died, but that those who partook of that bread of life which he brought from heaven should never die—should be raised up to eternal life. They looked for a terrestrial kingdom, and temporal glory

in their Messiah, and had received such evidences of his power, that they would have done any thing which he required of them, had he proclaimed himself the Messiah of their hopes, and promised to lead them on to victory in the contest of glorious war for the assertion of their independence. But when he thus brought forth in symbolic meaning, as he was clearly called to do, the true character of his kingdom, and told them plainly that, to be his subjects, they must eat his flesh, and drink his blood, these selfish and worldly hearers showed their contempt and real unbelief by leaving him altogether. This was plainly another crisis in our Lord's ministry. He was called upon to be explicit in declaring what were his real intentions when the multitudes of followers had formed and expressed such decided but such very erroneous ideas of these. In the figurative exposition of his doctrines there was nothing in the truth which should have shocked their belief, or transcended their understanding, but there was much in every respect calculated to outrage their prejudices, and overthrow their worldly hopes. The time was now come when it was necessary to do this, and when those who had formed such erroneous estimates of his character and undertaking, and shown themselves ready to act upon these prejudices, should be wholly undeceived. We take this to be one of the most striking displays of the heavenly character of Jesus, and of the boundless and divine knowledge which he possessed of the hearts of all men. When this plain manifestation of the spiritual character of his kingdom, and his knowledge of the selfish motives of many of his pretended disciples, had made numbers withdraw from their spurious profession of discipleship, he designedly appealed to the twelve apostles, whether they also had any inclination to desert him, because he had shown that his kingdom was not such as the Jews expected and wished. Peter, as always, took upon him to answer for the rest, and showing that he really understood the parabolic speech of his Master, declared that they could go to none other, for that he alone was capable of teaching them the doctrines of eternal life and heavenly truth. Whereupon Jesus gave them a most affecting proof of his knowledge of the characters of all his followers—he let them know that he had chosen the twelve to be witnesses of his life and miracles, and disciples of his doctrines, but that one of the body was to be an accuser and an enemy—"I have chosen twelve of you, and one is a devil." It is most deeply affecting to hear him who had laboured, against all discouragement, to make known the truth of eternal salvation, in the midst of sorrow and disappointment, and opposition, declare that he had designedly chosen one, who was to be his bitterest enemy and betrayer, to be with him constantly, to participate in all his instructions, to witness all his actions, public and private, to be his confidant in all points, while he knew, all the time, that he was the individual who was to bring him to a painful, and, according to the ideas of the world, a most ignominious end. He showed them thus early how far he could look forward to the future, and how intimately he had continually before him all the events of his life and of theirs. Gently and compassionately, on all occasions, did he bear with their natural infirmities, with their natural prejudices, with their dulness to apprehend, and slowness to believe—simply because he had selected unlearned men, weak and ignorant, to indoctrinate into truths which the wisest of the world could never discover, that they, in their weakness and illiterate ignorance, might "triumph over the mightiest and most learned of the world;" but from time to time he let them understand what terrible trials and temptations, as well as what high and unequalled destiny, awaited them. Had it been consistent with the great work which he came to accomplish, that he should have consented to the wishes of his disciples,

and of the enthusiastic multitudes, to become a king to their expectations, he would soon have gathered the warlike might of the expectant tribes around him, and in the exercise of the power and the knowledge which he possessed, he might have made the banner of victory float triumphantly over the hills and valleys of the chosen land. Had he been man only, working by human means for the attainment of selfish ends and personal aggrandizement, he would have listened to the voice of human ambition and personal glory. His, indeed, was to be a victory, the greatest ever obtained in this world—his was to be a kingdom, in which all others were to merge, but he was plainly constrained now to make his disciples understand that his kingdom was not to be of this world's dynasties, nor his victories to be gained by the might of fleshly arm, or the desolating triumph of exterminating war.

Though the disciples do not mention that Christ went up to the Passover which was alluded to as near, yet we have reason, from some hints given throughout the account which they have left of his ministry, that he went to this as well as to all the three great annual festivals of the Jews. He had put himself under all obedience to the ceremonial law of Moses, as long as it continued, as well as under that of the unchangeable moral law of God. None of these great commemorative ordinances are mentioned at which he is represented as not present, and the congregated Jews are always mentioned as expecting his appearance there. Had he not come up to commemorate the great festivals in honour of the deliverance from Egypt, of the giving of the law, and of the entrance into Canaan, they would have had a severer and juster accusation against him than any they had ever brought forward; for, by the law of God, every male of the Israelites who was in the country, and in health, that did not appear, was to be cut off from the people. He did appear, but the vindictive sects, now bent upon the destruction of one who exposed, so convincingly, their false doctrines and corrupt lives, had again made an attempt upon his life. But his work not being yet finished, and the peaceable execution of it not being possible among such rancorous enemies, he returned again into the more friendly region of Galilee. There they durst not venture to lay open and violent hands upon him, but we learn from the Evangelists that they sent spies to watch his conduct, to seek grounds of accusation, and to endeavour to excite the Galileans to his destruction. All these attempts only tended to expose their own gross corruptions the more decidedly, and to give the great Teacher of truth and spiritual religion an opportunity of setting forth the pure principles of his gospel. We learn from Josephus that the Pharisees were highly honoured by the people for the rigid strictness of their ceremonial observances; and, under the spurious authority of "Traditions of the Elders," which they pretended they had received directly from Moses, preserved, by oral communication, through successive generations of their Sanhedrim, they had added multitudes of their own superstitious inventions to the ritual of Moses. He had enjoined many observances of personal cleanliness as indicative of inward purity, and as the means of an elementary training to the habits of active obedience, but they had greatly multiplied these, and converted them into primary and important acts of religion itself. They attempted, therefore, to excite the popular prejudice against him, by finding fault with the disciples for eating bread without washing their hands, intimating that they must have contracted legal impurity by their contact with the many diseased and unclean who daily crowded to them. He turned the examination home upon themselves, by showing the hypocrisy of their lip-homage, and external bodily service, while their hearts were impure, and their motives wicked, and while they made these services of bodily drudgery supersede the spirit of the

moral law. He gave, as an instance, their avaricious doctrine in regard to the *corban*, or gift to the temple. Children might allow their parents to perish in poverty, provided they consecrated to the service of the priesthood what they could spare of their substance. Under the hypocritical cloak of hollow piety, they tempted men to be guilty of the grossest ingratitude, the most impious insult to the laws of their Heavenly Father. Instead of avoiding their hypocritical censorship, he called aloud upon the people, and let them know that it was not the legal impurities of the Pharisees that produced moral defilement, but the sinful thoughts of the mind, the sensual affections of the heart, the slanderous words of the mouth.

This was no casting of contempt upon the institutions of Moses, which established the distinction between clean and unclean meats, but proving upon the self-righteous, slanderous, and envious and murderous-minded Pharisees, how they subverted the whole spirit of that law by their superstitious traditions. These haughty and hypocritical men were highly offended at this contemptuous manner of treating their doctrines, and must have felt it the more severely, as they were certainly conscious of all the evil intentions which Jesus, by implication, attributed to them. The patient and compassionate Saviour of mankind bore meekly the contradiction and opposition of sinful men; but, when that insolent wickedness became grossly obtrusive, and outrageously condemned, and opposed itself to, truth and justice, he could also rebuke sharply. The Apostles seem now to have been afraid of the consequences of so severely and openly denouncing men of such influence, and to wish that he should be reconciled to those who, as they still thought, had such power of serving or obstructing his designs. He told his followers not to regard the wrath of such blind leaders, for that both they and their doctrines were condemned of God, and would be certainly overthrown. At their request he explained more fully the meaning of ceremonial rites, and the abuse of the Pharisaic doctrine on the subject.

But the bringer of peace, and teacher of good-will to men—who never resisted the fleshly arm of his bitter enemies—knowing their vindictive malice, and that they went away with a very different purpose from that of practising the pure and spiritual morality which he inculcated upon their convicted consciences, retired for a time beyond the confines of Galilee. This step also tended to throw new light on the minds of the disciples with regard to the nature of his undertaking. While he was in the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, a Syro-phœnician woman applied to him, with urgent entreaty, to heal her daughter, who was possessed, and grievously tormented with a devil. For a time he resisted all her entreaties, and even those of the disciples, that he might bring forth the faith of this despised and condemned Canaanite, that he might teach the Apostles, by example, that the time was coming when all distinctions of nation would be removed for ever. He appears even to treat her harshly, tells her that he was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel, and that it was not fit so to outrage their prejudices, and deprive the children of the covenant of the food intended for them, for the purpose of giving it to dogs—which was the bitter name of contempt given by the Jews to the heathen. Such cold apparent contempt did not damp, but only kindled, the ardour of her importunity, and she besought for only one crumb of that spiritual food which he distributed so profusely to the sons and daughters of Israel. Her persevering faith prevailed, and the compassionate Saviour granted her request, and commended the strength of that belief which had brought her to him. The malice of Satan was turned against himself, and intimation was given that the light of the Gospel was to dissipate the darkness

of his kingdom not only in the land of Judea, but also to cast the rays of its spiritual life into the ancient strongholds of heathen ignorance.

Still avoiding immediate intercourse with the Pharisees, he travelled along the northern borders of Palestine, and through the country of Decapolis, on the eastern side of Jordan and the lake of Genesareth. On this excursion he was accompanied by numbers of the heathen who had heard of his fame. Here he cured a man who was deaf and dumb, but privately, and with a charge to secrecy. Overwhelming multitudes were again gathered around him, and he was in the country where they had already wished to make him a temporal king—he was in the neighbourhood of Herod and his other enemies, and he wished to avoid giving them any grounds to take offence. But such a miracle could not be concealed. The people still crowded to hear and see him, and he again withdrew into a mountain near the lake of Galilee. It was now in the heat of summer, and he and his disciples remained in this solitude for several days. But his retreat was here also discovered, and the multitudes again came to him with the miserable victims of every kind of disease, and laid them before him. The eye of no jealous enemy was upon him in this desert solitude, and he openly healed all their diseases—giving sight to the blind, speech to the dumb, limbs to the maimed, and health and strength to the sick and the lame. We may remark with Macknight, that restoring the faculty of speech to the dumb was the least part of the miracle—these were generally deaf also, and must have been altogether ignorant of the expressions and ideas of articulate language. This faculty was also communicated, so that they could speak at once fluently and intelligently the language of the country, which had never before entered their ears, and which they could not possibly comprehend. Such amazing works of Almighty power might well astonish the multitude; and we learn that they also continued in the mountain with him three days. Their provision was exhausted before they seem to have been aware of their want, and Christ a second time exerted his creative power to feed a multitude of four thousand men, and perhaps as many women and children. Though none of his doctrines among these barren rocks are reported, we are not to suppose that he, who so compassionately supplied the fasting flock with the perishing bread which strengthened their mortal bodies, did not give them ample supply of that living bread which gives eternal life and spiritual strength to the soul, and which it was his chief object in coming into the world to supply. Though the scorching heat of a summer's sun had dried up the feeble and temporary runnels of the barren rock, his doctrine of refreshing power dropped as the vernal rain, and distilled as the dew of the neighbouring Hermon, and made the moral desert which lay before him in spiritual sterility to rejoice and blossom as the rose of Sharon.

It is not said on the present occasion that the people manifested any open intention of rallying under him as a political leader. Yet it is probable that the Pharisees expected that such was to be the case, and perhaps dreaded that one possessed of such authority, and who condemned them so loudly, would establish a power altogether subversive of theirs. For when, contrary to their guilty fears, he and his humble followers returned unattended to the west side of the lake, they came to him, in league with their hated enemies the Sadducees, to dispute his pretensions, and expose them, as they expected, to the ridicule of the people. During his absence, they seem to have been indoctrinating the multitudes into their own fond but false interpretation of the prophecy of Daniel, "that the Son of man was to come in the

clouds of heaven, and to receive from the Ancient of days dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." By this appeal to a test which they had established for themselves, and which they evidently thought him incapable of fulfilling, they expected to put an end to the excited expectations of the people. The design was clearly an impious tempting of God, and binding him down to fulfil his promises according to their false interpretations. Grieved at their incorrigible perverseness and hypocrisy, he told them again, in strong asseveration, that they should yet have their sign, in fulfilment of all the prophecies, but accomplished in a very different manner from what they expected. God had written definite characters upon the works of his hands, and by looking at the face of the sky, they could say what weather was portended; he had written as definite signs and characters in his revealed word, and if they attended to these with unprejudiced minds, willing to learn his purposes, they might easily read, in the signs of the times that were passing over them, the fulfilment of the prophecies about which they pretended to be so anxious. It is deeply affecting to behold our compassionate Saviour taking such unwearied pains to persuade men whose hypocritical obstinacy against all conviction he knew, whose final impenitence and deserved doom he foresaw, and was often compelled to pronounce. He left them, and having observed that the carnal views and wishes of his own disciples were too much in accordance with those of the bigoted enemies whom he had warned, he gave them a strong caution against being corrupted with the poisonous leaven of their doctrine, which was as much opposed to the pure simplicity and spirituality of the truths of his Gospel, as the grosser and more avowed sensual principles of the Sadducees, and the heathenish and impious tenets of the Herodians. They landed at Bethsaida, where he restored a blind man to sight, at the request of the inhabitants, indeed, but out of their city. He had had just cause to blame them for their impenitence and unbelief; and when he had led the man out of the town, and restored him to sight, he commanded him to return to his home, without going back to become a curious spectacle to those upon whose minds such a deed would now produce no good effect.

Notwithstanding all the mighty proofs which he had produced of his having come from God—notwithstanding the very plain and clear expositions which he had every where given of the truths which he came to teach, and of the object of his mission, we might be astonished at the confirmed obstinacy of the majority of the people. They did not, and they could not possibly doubt, that he was possessed of power and knowledge above all that man ever showed. They wondered at the mighty exhibition of the one, and felt the power of the other, which pierced the most secret folds of their hearts, the darkest retreats of their consciences. They all knew, therefore, that he was some mysterious visitant, who had been sent among them for some specific purpose; still they were Jews, with all the proverbial bigotry of that nation, mad, often to fanatic frenzy, with all the high hopes which their cherished prophecies encouraged them to entertain, and still under the sinister influence of their degenerate and corrupt spiritual guides. We cannot too often repeat it, because the idea meets us at every turn, and explains, to some extent, the otherwise unintelligible conduct of the nation, that they did at that time cherish the most eager expectation of their Messiah; but they had been taught to form for themselves a notion of the character in which he was to come, the power which he was to assume, the kingdom which he was to establish. The mighty notes of preparation which the angel visits to this earth had sounded, to which the audible

voice of the Eternal, from his invisible throne in the heavens, had responded, which the Baptist harbinger had confirmed, and the works of Jesus had verified, did compel them to believe that the Day-star of their most ambitious hopes was in the heavens; but when they looked to the lowly Jesus, and the still more lowly ministers by whom he was attended, their deeply-rooted prejudices made them meet a stumbling-block. They could not believe that this was he who was to wield the weapons of glorious warfare, to raise the fallen banner of David, and make it float on the breeze of victory over the prostrate legions of the iron tyranny of Rome. These expectations were most strongly and sincerely entertained by the thousands of Israel, and perversely encouraged, at this time, by their deluded teachers, who ought to have possessed more correct knowledge. But all was ordained by God, and overruled by him for the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom in the world.

The true Messiah saw that these views were also held in the vague hope of his Apostles. That he might therefore set before them now the true character in which he came, he retired with them from the usual place of his peregrinations, and went toward Cæsarea, on the coast of the Mediterranean. During this journey, he questioned them in regard to the opinions which the Jews held of his character and pretensions, with the intent of making them show what effect these had upon their own minds. They confessed that the whole belief of the people amounted only to a vague conjecture, some thinking that he was the Baptist returned to the world, others, Elijah, or Jeremiah, or some other of the ancient prophets. Preparatory to his fully declaring his real character, he asked them to express their own belief, and Peter, always ardent, confessed for the whole, that he believed him to be the Christ, the Son of the living God! His Master highly commended him for such faith, to which all the conclusions of the priests and the learned in Judea could not have led him, but only the revelation of the God of truth. As the representative of the others in this profession of faith, he conferred upon him the charter of a higher power than had ever before been given to any of the children of Adam. Through him, and through them, he should erect a kingdom, against which all the destructive powers of earth and of hell should never prevail; he gave them the keys of the kingdom of heaven; the high privilege of admitting into the Messiah's kingdom both Jew and Gentile; the power of administering the law of judgment, which showed how the sins of men were to be forgiven both on earth and in heaven.

This was high privilege, and power far above the most ambitious that the victorious conquerors of this earth had ever vanquished for themselves, or even, in their vain assumption of divinity, had ever pretended to aim at. But our Saviour having plainly made known the character which he assumed, and the nature of that kingdom which he was to establish on earth, and charged his disciples to conceal it, till the fulness of the time for asserting and establishing it should come, made them plainly to understand what were the humiliating and painful steps by which that loftiest height of glory and power was to be reached. He was to be rejected and dishonoured by the great, and mighty, and learned of the land; he was to be apprehended, and tried, and put to death, as an impostor and malefactor, by the elders, and priests, and scribes; but was to rise again the third day. Peter, whose bold spirit had formed very different hopes, surmised that this last declaration was the despondent anticipation of a mind under the influence of melancholy, and with over-weening kindness, rebuked his Master for indulging in such gloomy thoughts. He still, with all his sincere professions, and under all the honours which his Master had conferred upon him, looked only for such a kingdom and power as the devil had at

first lyingly offered to confer. The true Messiah rebukes the mistaken zeal of him whom he had newly honoured with the title of first steward of his heavenly kingdom, in the very same terms as he had repelled the assault of the great tempter to false ambition—"Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men." And to disabuse them of the false hopes which they still entertained of temporal glory and power, he told openly in presence of all the people, that those who followed him were not to look for the rewards or glory of this world, but for poverty, and persecution, and contempt—that they must renounce all such vain hopes, and be prepared to "take up their cross as condemned malefactors, and follow him." He told them that the glory and happiness of this world was not for a moment to be compared to that which he proposed—that he looked beyond this life, and directed their hopes to a time when the Son of man should indeed come in his glory, as the scribes and Pharisees pretended to expect, but it would be at the day of final award, when all should be dealt with according to their works. And to give them a prophetic sign, such as their teachers had instructed them to expect, he informed them that "some there should not taste of death till they saw the kingdom of God come with power." Like Mary, they must have treasured up these high sayings of mysterious import in their heart. They could not, and it was not meant that they should, pierce the impenetrable veil of the future, and foresee all that was to happen, and in the sad reality, as far as this life was concerned, of the humiliation and sufferings reserved for their Master and for them. But as in the first prophecy of deliverance in Eden, and of victory through suffering, their hopes were directed onward through scenes of sorrow and disappointed hopes and mysterious suffering to the certain and glorious prospect of triumph and power, and unalloyed happiness.

About a week after this conversation in regard to the mysterious humiliation, and as mysterious glory and power, to which the Son of man directed the thoughts and expectations of his followers, he took three of the most distinguished, Peter, James, and John, to a high mountain, to give them a visible representation of something of that majesty which was now concealed under the veil of his humanity. While he prayed, his human form was invested with the glory of heaven, his face became bright as the sun, and his raiment shone with the dazzling whiteness of snow. Moses and Elijah—the one the great lawgiver, the other the bold champion and fearless assertor of the law—appeared in the mount in glorified bodies, conversing with him. Moses had witnessed his glory before, when he descended in the awful terror of overawing majesty, and established his legislative throne on the trembling top of Sinai. Elijah had also seen his glory in the wilderness, when surrounded by the terrors of earthquake and whirlwind, and the fire of heaven, when the mountains were shaken, and the rocks were rent in pieces. Both had prophesied of his coming, and as zealous servants had ministered in their day in the preparation for his kingdom, and they now came from the glories of heaven to converse upon the final accomplishment of that great work to which all prophecy pointed, and from which all the ritual service of the Jews depended and derived its meaning. All these prophecies were soon to get full accomplishment, and the symbolic meaning of all those material rites of the temple worship was to be fully explained. No wonder, therefore, that the subject of their conversation was that great sacrifice which he was to offer up at Jerusalem, in which it was to be shown, to principalities and powers in heaven, that God was a just as well as merciful governor, that Christ was the end of the law for righteousness, the bestower of an everlasting justification. "How great a happiness," observes

Bishop Hall, "was it for these two great prophets, in their glorified flesh, to see the glorified Saviour, who, before his incarnation, had spoken to them—to speak to that man-God, of whom they were glorified, and to become prophets not to men, but to God! And if the face of Moses so shone before, when he spoke to him without a body on Mount Sinai, in the midst of flames and clouds, how did it shiue now, when himself glorified, speaks to him a man on Mount Tabor, in light and majesty! Elias hid his face before in a mantle when he passed by him in the rock—now, with open face, he beholds him present, and in his own glory adores him." It would seem that the dazzling glory of such celestial brightness overpowered the human weakness of the apostles, and they sunk under its unsufferable majesty. Like Daniel and others, who have been favoured with angelic visitants in their robes of celestial light, they fell upon their faces, and exhausted humanity sought the refreshing refuge of sleep. But before the scene of the transfiguration was over they were again wakened, and the forward Peter, thinking now that all their anticipations of terrestrial glory were about to be realized, wished to detain the departing prophets, and proposed, in the confused amazement of his mind, to erect three tents. Probably he wished that the glorious three should remain there till the rest of the disciples, as well as the cavilling scribes and Pharisees, should see such a convincing and undoubted sign from heaven. But while he spoke he knew not what, the cloudy pillar of divine glory, of which they had so often read in the writings of Moses, overshadowed them, and the voice of the supreme Majesty of heaven uttered, for the second time, the high sanction of his authority to the divinity of the Son of man—"This is my beloved Son, hear him." The prophetic power, and the prophetic voice, now resided in him. Moses had done his duty while on earth, and his law was now at an end, when He, who gave it by his ministry, had come to take upon him the authority of present Lawgiver. The work of Elijah was also finished, and the Messiah was to establish his own government by his own authority. The scene of celestial glory passed away, and the terror and confusion of the Apostles also disappeared, when they found that they were alone with their condescending Master. It is not apparent, from the narrative of the Evangelists, whether this transfiguration and divine colloquy took place during the day or night, but they remained on the mount all night. As they were descending, Jesus charged them not to reveal the vision to any one till he should rise from the dead. Though they had heard repeatedly of this termination of the labours of their divine Master, their own preconceived notions, and the fascination of the terrestrial throne of David, which the striking event just witnessed no doubt awoke anew, prevented them from seeing the cross and the dark valley of death which lay between. They had seen Elijah with Christ, and knowing, and still perhaps believing, the doctrine of the scribes, that he was to come first and restore the scattered tribes, they could not yet understand the mystery of that predicted death, and asked Jesus about the coming of that prophet. He let them understand that he had already come, and executed his predicted office, in the person of John, whose reception and fate they knew. He again told them that the Son of man should meet with no better reception, and no better treatment, at the hands of the Jews. This was a melancholy assurance, after such a demonstration of heavenly beings paying homage to their Master; but they were now daily surrounded with events, and listened to declarations, which gave at once a trial, and supplied an assurance to their faith.

When they were returned to the plain, they found the rest of the disciples surrounded by the multitude, and the scribes disputing with them. The face of

Christ, like that of Moses after the divine interview, seems to have retained something of the heavenly splendour in which it had been invested, for, when the multitudes saw him, they were greatly amazed at his appearance, and saluted him with eager humility. He learned the cause of the dispute, which was about a lunatic whom the apostles had not been able to heal. It appears probable that the scribes were making a profane boast, that here was a devil whom neither the disciples nor He could cast out, for he sharply rebuked their obstinate and sinful unbelief, which resisted demonstrative evidence of all kinds. Yet, once more to leave them without every palliation or excuse for their unbelief, he requested the youth to be brought to him, and at the request of his father, who gave an account of the fearful sufferings of his tormented son, he ordered the evil spirit to depart. He afterwards, upon the questioning of his disciples as to their want of success on the present occasion, informed them, that the chief reason was their own want of faith. — If they exercised undoubting faith in the power of their Master, and in that which he had conferred upon them, they might remove mountains by the power of their word. He also informed them, that there were degrees of power among the evil spirits, and that, in the case of the one whom he had now expelled, it demanded fasting and prayer, as well as faith, on the part of any who would endeavour to expel him.

We read not that this display of night, unresistingly obeyed by the most powerful and reluctant of the spirits of evil, had any salutary effect on the minds of the blinded and prejudiced Pharisees and scribes. We have every reason to believe the contrary. It amazed the disciples, indeed, and they again entertained their mistaken hopes of their Master's subduing all opposition by such power. He understood their thoughts, and while they passed privately through Galilee, neither preaching nor working miracles, he again solemnly assured them of the sad truth which they were so slow to believe, so averse to consider as probable or likely. Even then they turned away their minds from it, and while they were deeply grieved at hearing their Master talk to them in this manner, and afraid to ask him an explanation of a circumstance which transcended their reason to comprehend, they spent their own private hours during that journey in settling, or rather disputing among themselves, who was to be greatest in that kingdom, which they looked upon as certainly and speedily to be erected. Their sympathizing Master left the correction of this mistake till a fitter season, and went with them to Capernaum.

It was while here that the collectors of the national tribute applied to Peter, asking whether Jesus paid that tax. Peter answered in the affirmative; but, when he went to inform his Master of the demand, Christ anticipated the information, and by arguing, that as the Son of the King of kings, and Heir of all things, he was exempt from all taxes of the kind, showed the Apostle that he had answered the demand hastily. Notwithstanding, that they might give no cause of offence, either to their Roman masters, or to those who collected the tribute for the support of the temple, he sent Peter to the lake, telling him that he would find in the first fish's mouth a piece of money, which would satisfy the demand made upon both.*

* The tax imposed was a *didrachma*, equivalent to the half-shekel, or fifteen pence of our money; the coin which Peter found in the mouth of the fish was a *stater*, equivalent to two shillings and sixpence. It is doubted whether the tax was Roman or Jewish—we are inclined, from the reasoning of Christ, to suppose the latter, though the lesson of peaceable obedience inculcated is the same in either sense. It would seem that Judas was not present with the bag, or that the humble treasury of the Heir of all things was exhausted. It gives us a most mournful view of the destitute condition of Him through whose poverty we are enriched; we might add, that it gives a bitter reproof to those who refuse to pay the taxes of a Christian government, when imposed for a legal object.

Having given them this lesson of obedience to the powers that existed, he proceeded to set before them an illustration, humiliating to their mistaken ambition, in regard to the rank and dignity which was to subsist in the kingdom to which he had called them. He gave them proof that he was aware of the subject of their dispute during their journey thither, and, taking a little child, and placing him in the midst, told them, that unless they had humility like such a child—unless they were converted, and became docile and dependent like such a one, they could not enter that kingdom; that in his kingdom, the greatest humility was the standard of the greatest dignity. John, who seems to have taken the reproof as intended for himself, wishing to divert the attention of Christ to another subject connected with the authority of his kingdom, informed him of their having prevented one, whom they saw casting out devils in Christ's name, because he was not of their company. Jesus corrected this mistake, and showed that whatever was the motive or belief of such an individual, he could not be decidedly against the cause which He undertook. Then, proceeding in the censure of their own miscalculating rivalry, he shows them that it is through this spirit of pride and ambition that offences are most easily given; that the meek and lowly, with the confiding spirit of a child, were peculiarly his friends; that every kindness shown to them, he would take as done personally to himself, and that every offence given to them, or injury inflicted upon them, he would resent and punish as an act of pride and oppression done to himself. He therefore inculcates upon them the necessity of mortifying every passion of pride and worldly ambition, even to cut off a right hand, or pluck out a right eye, rather than, through gratifying their earthly desires, to incur the eternal displeasure of God, who watches with the most parental care over such humble individuals. He compares his own conduct in this respect to that of a careful shepherd, who leaves his whole flock, and goes into the wilderness in search of one stray sheep, and rejoices more in its recovery than in retaining all the rest. In like manner, the recovery of one lost sinner to the lowly flock of Christ causes joy among the angels of heaven. He then lays down the rule to be followed by the person to whom the offence is given, not to resist in the same spirit, but to expostulate in private, and to take all possible means of reconciliation. Then, as it would seem, being aware that this dispute among his followers about the right of precedency in his kingdom had arisen from some imagined superiority conferred on Peter, he bestows upon all his Apostles the power of binding and loosing, and that not only in point of doctrine, but also of discipline, in the points to which he had been referring. If they agreed together in His name, he promised to be always in the midst of them, and to obtain an answer to their petitions. Then, in conclusion, and in answer to a supposed case of Peter's, how often he should forgive an offending brother, in the most striking and affecting parable of the unjust steward, he inculcated the doctrine of unlimited forgiveness of wrongs done to ourselves, if we would expect forgiveness of God for debts infinitely great, which we have incurred toward him.*

It is supposed that these events and discourses took place a short time previous to the fourth passover during Christ's ministry, and that the journey which he now made to Jerusalem was to that festival. This is calculated most successfully to reconcile the narrative of the various events which follow. It is consistent also with the resolution which he had formed of being much in private during this time with

* We may add, by way of note, that the 10,000 talents forgiven to the unjust steward, were equal to nearly L.2,000,000, while the debt of his fellow servant, which he would not forgive, was only L.3.

his disciples, and confining his instruction chiefly to them. It is a matter of no great consequence as to the general proof of the truth of the whole design of his ministry but, being the most natural order, we shall proceed upon the supposition that his journey by the circuitous route of Perea, on the east of Jordan, was to the pass-over; and that he went this way for the purpose of going thither privately. He had not yet visited that distant country, yet his fame was known, and multitudes followed him with their sick, who were cured; and no doubt he scattered, as they passed, the words of eternal life. He celebrated the feast of the great deliverance as usual, but, avoiding the hostile attempts of the bigoted Pharisees, he retired in peace to the now friendly shores of the lake of Galilee.

There is an interval of calm during this period, the events and discourses of which are not recorded; but it is probable that he spent the intervening months chiefly in converse with his own little chosen flock. Their hopes and expectations had strangely obscured their minds in regard to the spiritual nature of that kingdom to which they were called, and the hour of the fiercest and longest struggle was coming. He had now visited all the land of Israel, and his works of surpassing might, as well as the nature of those doctrines which he taught, were generally, or rather universally, known. But, wonderful though those works were, and convincing, beyond all objection, though the proof was, that He who wrought them was commissioned of God; yet, so perversely warped were the prejudices of the Jews in regard to the character of Him who was to be their Messiah—the victorious son of David—that even his own relations had doubts whether they should believe on him or not. The Feast of Tabernacles, which commemorated their Father's ceasing their wanderings in the wilderness, was at hand, and they urged him to go to Jerusalem, and show, in presence of the collected tribes and their rulers, those works which he had so profusely exhibited over all Galilee. They knew, as every Jew must have known, the proof that those works gave of his divine authority, but they did not know the great object for which they were wrought, and the manner in which that object was to be finally accomplished. They must naturally have had their hopes and their wishes, and knowing the power which he had displayed, they desired Jesus to go to Jerusalem, accompanied by the thronging multitudes who were passing. He refused, because his time “was not yet come,” to stand forth in open opposition to the combined force of the princes and rulers of the world. Had he chosen to gain the conviction of their prejudices, and the enthusiastic homage of the multitudes in this way, and the martial conquest of a kingdom, by force opposed to force, in the strife of earthly glory, he could have long ago satisfied such hopes. But the Prince of Peace was not come to war with the sword, but with the spiritual weapons of truth, and in lowliness and subjection, in the midst of opposition, and persecution, and rejection. From the very conditions of the terrible contest, it was necessary that he should enter upon it alone—that of the people there should be none to help him. This had been predicted, and, as the final struggle was drawing nigh, the circumstances in which he chose to place himself, and the fore-doomed prejudices of the sinful nation which he had to encounter, gradually and necessarily brought men to this condition of mind, in which He must be persecuted, and rejected, and condemned.

Jesus, therefore, allowed the multitude of his countrymen and friends to depart for this most joyous of all their festivals, and abode still in Galilee. The reason which he gives is very affecting—“The world hated Him, because the works of the men of the world were evil.” But he was still subject to the Jewish law; and

though his friends seem to have thought that he intended to slight one of the most solemn institutions of their great legislator, he had no such intention—he went up privately to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast. The celebration continued eight days, and he remained the half of that time in unnoticed privacy. This unusual non-appearance of one so known and distinguished, and whose presence was evidently expected by all classes, friends as well as foes, gave rise to perplexing discussions in regard to his character. The bigoted scribes and Pharisees represented him as an impostor and breaker of the law, alleging, most likely, his intentional absence on this occasion as a proof of their assertion. His friends were overawed by the authority of their teachers, or did not know how to justify his conduct. He soon appeared to justify himself. About the middle of the festival, he appeared openly in the crowded courts of the temple, and taught his doctrines with his overwhelming power, and convincing argument. This excited the usual vacant wonder among the people, how one who never had the benefit of their learned instructors could so expound the mysteries of their law. He answered their thoughts, or whispered wonder, by declaring, that his doctrine was learned of no human teacher, but of the Father of lights—that therefore he taught, not to seek his own glory from men, but to advance the glory of his Father. It was their own evil inclinations which prevented them seeing this; if they loved truth and righteousness themselves, they would soon come to acknowledge the heavenly truth and holiness of the doctrine which he taught. They had objected to him his breaking of the Sabbath, but he turned the objection upon them for their murderous intentions against his life. He justified his own conduct, and carried conviction to the minds of many of the people, who concluded that He who did such works must have come to them from God. But, in proof of the strength of human prejudice, the unbelief of their rulers, and their trust in their own erroneous and contradictory interpretations of their prophecies, still acted as a stumbling-block. They could not believe that a Prophet could rise out of Galilee, and they believed that when Messiah came, no one would know whence he derived his origin. By reasoning calmly with their prejudices, and enlightening their ignorance of their own scriptures, he gained the believing assent of many, for a time at least. This conduct of the common people greatly incensed the rulers—they called a council, and sent men to apprehend and bring him before them. This took place several days after, on the last and most noisy day of their rejoicing. In the meantime, he continued to warn and exhort the Jews to improve the advantage which they now enjoyed—the time of his ministry was near a close, and they would afterwards have reason bitterly to regret their neglect in not listening to the doctrines which he now preached to them. On this last day of the feast, it was a custom, alluded to in the Old Testament, to bring water from the brook or well of Siloam to the temple, and drink it with the loudest acclaim of music and exultation, in memory of the water brought from the rock to quench the thirst of their fathers in the desert. Our divine Teacher, taking advantage of this practice, invited all to the fountains of that spiritual knowledge and grace which he was ready to supply—a living water, which would quench the thirst of the soul, and well forth from it as a perennial spring, to refresh the souls of all who, through them, would believe on him.

While the true King and High-priest of his people was thus uttering the words of life and consolation to all, compassionately inviting every one to come to those spiritual fountains of eternal happiness which he now openly declared he would supply, the messengers of death, from the corrupt priests and unjust judges of hi

people, were in the midst of the crowd to apprehend him. That eye of Omniscience which searcheth the secrets of all hearts, saw their wicked designs, and that Almighty power could have in an instant brought the vengeance of guiltless blood on their heads. But the melting power of that pathetic appeal, the striking spiritual application of that symbolic custom, representing the whole scene to the mind as a present and visible, yet spiritual reality, penetrated their guilty hearts, and disarmed those hands ready for a deed of lawless violence. The thrilling power of persuasive truth vanquished the brute force of tyrannical violence; and those who came as murderers returned with feelings which were likely to end in their becoming sincere disciples. Again the half convictions of the people struggled with their prejudices—they would have believed, but the external appearance and lowly followers of Christ revolted their preconceived notions of what the Son of David should be.

The report of the softened officers to the assembled council, expecting their victim in chains, that the power of his eloquence was above that of man, and that they durst not lay hands on him, exasperated the bigoted hypocrites to a pitch of violent railing. But Nicodemus, the secret convert to the doctrines of Christ, who, they could not pretend, was ignorant of the law and the prophets, as well as their servants, checked the farther progress of their cruelty in the meantime, by arraigning the legality of their own proceedings, in thus condemning without the pretence of listening to a defence. This was a modest, yet a cutting reproof. They felt it; but as is natural with guilty and prejudiced men, instead of acknowledging their error, taunted him with being a Galilean, from whose heathen land no prophet arose. In which assertion they showed their ignorance of their history and prophecies, as they had done of their law, for Jonah was of Gath-hepher, a town of Galilee. Their evil design was broken; they separated, with hate and jealousy still as inveterate. The crowds went to their homes, and the persecuted Man of Sorrows, knowing their intentions, retired, it would appear alone, to the homeless and sleepless solitude of the Mount of Olives.

But his implacable and restless enemies had now formed another device, by which they expected certainly to ensnare him to his disgrace and destruction. Next day, while he was teaching in the temple, regardless of their plots and malice, they brought before him a woman caught in adultery, and desired him to pronounce what sentence should be executed upon her, telling him what was that of the law of Moses. It was a cunning plot to catch Jesus in a dilemma, for they knew that the administration of the civil law was now in the hands of the Romans, and the Roman governor, Pilate, as jealous and cruel as his most jealous master. If, therefore, he should say that the woman ought to be stoned, according to the law of Moses, they would accuse him to the procurator as stirring the people to sedition, by taking upon himself the character of a judge. If he should say that she ought not, but to be dealt with according to the law of the alien, then they would denounce him to the fanatic people as a denier of the authority of Moses, and a rebel against the law of Heaven, and thus expose him to their fury. Jesus pretended not to hear them for a time, but at last threw their difficulty upon themselves, and brought their convicted and guilty consciences into the dilemma which they intended for him, by asking the individual among them guiltless of such a sin (for so the expression will bear) to throw the first stone. Such a searching reply they had not expected, and, fearing lest he who knew so well their secret guilt would also proclaim it to their public confusion, they withdrew one by one, "beginning at the eldest, even unto the last," as John expresses it; intimating clearly that the greyer they became

in age, the stronger and more confirmed were they in guilt. Jesus, who came not to judge or condemn, by the sentence of human law, even the guiltiest, but to pity and to save, dismissed the woman, with a command to sin no more.

The patient Teacher of truth, in the midst of all opposition and discouragement, continued his divine instructions, and set before the people at great length, and in higher and clearer terms than he had hitherto done, the nature of his character and mission—he was the true light of the world—he had come from his heavenly Father, who had borne such clear testimony to his authority, and to Him he would soon return—that he would be lifted up and be prepared to draw all to him—to bestow upon all the only true liberty, that of truth. He told them that their boast of being Abraham's children was vain, for their spirit and conduct proved that they were really the children of the devil, who was a deceiver and a murderer—that Abraham had longed with joy to see his day—that, though so lowly to appearance now, he was before Abraham. This high assumption of divinity would indeed have been blasphemy in the mouth of any created being, and so the Jews understood it—they took up stones to stone him to death as one who made himself equal with God. But He, who eluded by his guileless wisdom the cunning malice of the Pharisees, walked unharmed through the more violent, and as unreasoning rage of the bigoted multitude. Their violent prejudices did not prevent him from the performance of his works of mercy. As he and the disciples passed along, they asked him about the state of a blind beggar who sat by the side of the street—whether he * or his parents had sinned, that he had been so afflicted. Christ told them that this blindness was the effect of neither, but, for the manifestation of the power of God, an opportunity for him to demonstrate that he had come as the Light of the world. It was the Sabbath-day, and the true Physician designedly used greater ceremony on occasion of this cure than the mere voice of command. He spit upon the ground, and made an ointment, rubbed it on the sightless eyes, and told the blind man to go and wash in the pool of Siloam. The man, who could not be altogether ignorant of the fame of Christ's miracles, believed, did as he was commanded, and obtained the blessing of sight. This circumstance excited an unusual commotion. The people, who had known him to be blind from his birth, carried him before the great council, who strictly examined him and his parents in regard to his former state, and the manner in which he had received his sight. They first attempted to prove the man himself an impostor, and that expedient failing them, from the convincing evidence that he had never enjoyed the use of his eyes before, they endeavoured, by cunning sophistry and threats of their bitterest vengeance, to induce the poor man himself to declare that he believed Jesus to be an impostor, who wrought by magic. Their active malice was unavailing. The man had the use of his reason as well as they, and used it more correctly, when they did compel him unwillingly to pronounce his opinion. He would not presume to say whether Jesus was a prophet or not, in presence of the learned rabbis of his nation, but he would venture, since

* It has been supposed, and apparently with good reason, that the apostles believed in the false doctrines of the Pharisees, that there was a transmigration of souls, though chiefly those of the righteous, after their death. Frequent allusion is made to this belief in the history of the Gospels, where the Jews are represented as believing Jesus and John to be some of the ancient prophets revived. We need not attempt to confute this absurdity of heathen Platonism, which is contradicted by the whole of the Gospel. Several writers think that this miracle was not wrought on the present occasion, but two months after, at the feast of Dedication, at which our Lord was, and where he made himself known to the man whose sight he had restored.

they urged him to it, to declare, that he believed Jesus to be no sinner, but a man favoured of God, since God listened to no sinner, and Jesus had done a work which could be done only by power communicated from heaven. These were the plain conclusions of an unsophisticated mind, and delivered with unwilling modesty, but still with confidence, by a man who had every motive not to irritate the rulers and priests of the people. They were above reasoning with such a one, or endeavouring farther to reclaim him, and taunting the poor man as a proved sinner, because he was born under such a misfortune, and with unspeakable presumption for endeavouring, when compelled, to teach such as they how to reason, and draw conclusions in theology, pronounced their *maranatha*, and excommunicated him from the synagogue.*

As the deepest degradation in moral depravity into which man had ever sunk—as the darkest night of spiritual ignorance which had ever settled down over the hopeless earth, was the fulness of time in which God sent into the world the only true Physician, and made the true day-spring from on high dawn upon those who were falling into the sleep of endless death—so these exhibitions of invincible infidelity and judicial perversity in resisting the most triumphant proofs of Christ's Messiahship, were the evident signs that his life of sorrow and privation, and his labours of exhaustless patience and compassion, were drawing to a close. He no longer sought the safe and peaceful retreat of the distant Galilee, nor courted the friendly protection of the grateful centurions, or powerful rulers of Capernaum. As the feast of Dedication—an additional festival, instituted by Judas Maccabæus, in commemoration of his having cleansed the temple from the heathen abominations of the tyrant Antiochus—approached, we are told by Luke that “he steadfastly set his face to go up to Jerusalem.” On this occasion he was not alone, nor accompanied by the twelve only; he had with him a number of followers, and his disciples evidently entertained the hope that their expectations of a kingdom, they did not know of what kind, were now to be fulfilled. In passing through the country of the Samaritans, he sent messengers before him to provide accommodation for him and his followers in one of their towns. The inhabitants refused them even admittance, because he was going to worship in Jerusalem. This was an unkind exhibition of inveterate prejudice toward him who had shown them such kindness. But the ambitious spirit of the disciples was now kindled, and they would retort hatred with vengeance. “The sons of thunder”—the habitually gentle spirit of John, and of his more ambitious brother James—took fire at this intentional insult, and they requested permission to call fire from heaven, and consume such infidel enemies, alleging the conduct of Elijah, who had shown such an example of punishment against the wicked attempts of the idolatrous Ahaziah. But the merciful Saviour had introduced a dispensation which required not the sanction of such a display of power, and rebuked his over-zealous followers, as showing an inexcusable ignorance of the spirit of the gospel which they professed and preached. He left the perverse and ungrateful town, and journeyed onwards. His reply to an individual who offered to accompany him wherever he went, after such an inhospitable repulse, is patheti-

* There were two degrees of excommunication among the Jews—the lesser, by which the individual was prevented from coming within four cubits of others, but might enter the synagogue and hear the service—the other the *maranatha*, by which he was excluded for ever; and this seems to have been the sentence of the man in question. But his eyes were opened to a clearer light than theirs, and the door of a better synagogue received him.

cally affecting—"The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." He had given such an answer, in similar circumstances, before, to an applicant of a similarly selfish ambition, as also to two others who offered now to be of his company. The general conclusion from these replies is, that all who follow him, and devote themselves to his service, must renounce the friendships and ties that would interfere with either suffering or acting in his cause.

It is not told us where he did get a place to lay his head in that inhospitable region, but his own infinite compassion, and all surveying care, are duly noted. The harvest was plentiful, and he again sent forth another band of labourers to prepare his way. It was to Judea and Perea, the country beyond Jordan, to which his labours were now to be confined; and appointing servants to this work, and telling them specifically what cities he was to visit, sent them in pairs to preach his speedy advent to the same places. The time was short, and they were not to linger in friendly salutations by the way. He gave otherwise nearly the same instructions as he had given to the twelve, when he sent them forth on a similar preparatory and warning mission in Galilee. To show them the awful importance of their commission, he pronounced a judicial woe upon those cities by the Lake of Galilee—Capernaum, and Chorazin, and Bethsaida—which had enjoyed so much of his personal ministrations, had seen so many of his mighty deeds, and listened to so many of his discourses of heavenly wisdom, but which were now to see his face no more in his lowly humanity. We are not told by Luke, who alone, of the Evangelists, relates these events, how long the seventy continued in their hurried peregrinations, but they returned to his society full of joy, boasting that even the devils were obedient to their power. They had executed their duty faithfully, and he increased their gifts of power; but, lest they should be too proud of any glory or dignity that could be enjoyed on this earth, or rather, to divert their fond thoughts from that temporal kingdom and dignity to which all of them still eagerly clung, he told them of a higher subject of joy—that their names were written as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem. On this occasion also he broke forth into that ecstatic exultation of spirit which he had shown on a previous occasion, that though the wise and learned of the world would not know or receive the blessings which he came to give, yet that they were communicated to babes in knowledge. He let them understand, in the same high rapture of the "joy set before him," that God had given all power into his hands. This he seems to have said publicly, in presence of the multitude; but he added to the cause of rejoicing, by telling his own followers that they were more highly favoured than the pious and holy kings and prophets of old, who had seen only dimly, in symbolical vision and anxious hope, what they had seen and heard in present reality.

It would appear that one of the self-righteous scribes, or lawyers, as Luke calls him, was witness to this interview, for it immediately follows, that such an individual stood up, or set himself forward, to exhibit his own skill in the law, and to try that of one who, as he thought, assumed too much. He asked Jesus, tempting him, what he should do to inherit eternal life? The true Giver of the law, who alone knew its spirit, referred him to the written letter, knowing his presumptuous design. The scribe knew the letter of the law, and thought that he also knew its spirit, for when He, who saw through the presumption of his self-righteous heart, told him that if he could obey all the law, which he knew so well, he should have eternal life, he

proceeded to question Jesus upon the duty due to our neighbour. Forgetting the inhospitality of the Samaritans, he instructed this confident teacher of the law of righteousness, by the beautiful parable of the charitable Samaritan, who had pitied and restored a Jew to life, when he had been left to perish by priest and Levite—that even his bitterest enemies were the neighbours whom he was to love and to succour. This practical illustration of the extent to which acceptable obedience was required, at least satisfied the proud rabbi that he did not know so much of the spiritual and wide extent of that law as he had thought. This interview, altogether, is one of the most striking illustrations of the divine knowledge which Christ possessed of human character, and of the motives of those who applied to him. He told the scribe, according to the language of the Sinaitic covenant, and in answer to his question, that if he could give *perfect* obedience to its precepts, he would inherit eternal life—then proves to him, in one of the plainest of its commands, how far he was from understanding or obeying it, and left his convicted conscience to draw the inference, and take the next step of finding a satisfactory and atoning substitute.

The next place in which we meet Jesus, he was in company of a very different kind—in the midst of the affectionate family of Lazarus and his sisters at Bethany. Here there was no captious disputer, no cavilling and tempting questioner. We see Mary, in humble and delighted attention, sitting at the feet of the Teacher of truth, while Martha, intent on hospitable thoughts, is busied with her domestic preparations, knowing, or having heard of, the Samaritan inhospitality. But, even of hospitable intentions, the excess may lead to an anxiety and absorbing of the mind bordering on sin. In her bustling activity, she was displeased at the apparent idleness and carelessness of her sister, and thought all others as well as she should view it in the same light, and complained, with some discontent, to Jesus of her sister's thoughtless conduct. He to whom the communication of his Father's will was at all times meat and drink, whatever might be the craving wants of human nature, gave Martha a gentle reproof for her too anxious desire to exert her hospitality, and commended her sister, who was more desirous to feast her soul on that bread and water of life which never perished.

From this village and friendly home he passed onward to Jerusalem, to observe the Festival of Dedication. Here he met the excommunicated man whom he had restored to sight at his last visit, told him that he was the Son of God, and received and accepted of his worship in that character. This declaration and act were both in public, in presence of his ever-watchful enemies, and he now openly declared, that he had come into the world, not merely to give light to the blind, to teach the truth of heaven to the ignorant and humble believer, but to confirm the judicial blindness of those who thought themselves wise and learned, while, in ignorant pride, they resisted the force of heavenly truth. This imputation the Pharisees, in their high conceit of themselves, would have set aside, but Jesus confirmed it with still severer censure. He was walking in the porch of the temple, in sight of the folds of sheep which were brought thither to be sold to those who came to sacrifice, and, in the parabolic figurative style, which is so beautiful and striking, gave the character of himself as the true Shepherd who knew all his sheep—who led them forth to the green pastures—who was known by all his true flock—who defended them against every ravening wolf—against all the attacks of thieves and robbers, and who was ready to lay down his life for them. In contrast to this, he gave the character of the Pharisees, and the self-constituted teachers of the Jews, who, for their own ends,

had usurped that function over the priests, contrary to the law of Moses. They were mercenary and rapacious, who cared neither for feeding the flock nor for defending them—who, like the great first thief, sprung into God's fold with the wolfish purpose of rending and destroying, but who, like cowardly and mercenary shepherds, if any personal danger approached, cared for themselves alone, deserted their charge, and fled. He let these self-righteous men, who thought that they were the only chosen and favoured flock of the "Shepherd of Israel," understand that he had other sheep who were not of their fold—that he was to bring all into one, and be the universal Shepherd, not only of the children of Abraham, but of all the sons of Adam. This was a plain declaration of doctrine, and He who saw the calm malignity of the hearts of his enemies, and knew their relentless design of murder, told them, that he would lay down his life willingly for his flock, though no man could take it from him;—he had power to surrender, and he had power to take it again. Many of the people must have known that this character which he gave of their pretended spiritual pastors was according to reality. It was, to them, too plain and too bitter truth, and they would have eagerly persuaded the people that such sayings were the ravings of a madman, urged on by the malice of the devil against them. But the home-felt force of that truth was too powerful—the people were in anxious suspense, and his enemies durst attempt nothing.

This high assumption of authority, and this divided state of public feeling, gave his enemies an opportunity of laying a snare for him, which, they expected, would be successful. While he was in the discharge of his usual duty in the temple porch, they gathered round, and asked him, in apparent earnestness, to keep them no longer in doubt or suspense, but to tell them plainly whether or not he was the Messiah. He had often declared this before to more sincere inquirers after the truth, but as he never performed a miracle for the satisfaction of the curious, or the obstinately sceptical, so neither would he declare the truth on this point, to those who questioned him with no wish to believe it. But he appealed to his works—they spoke for him; he appealed to his doctrine, and to their own Scriptures, and told them, that the cause of their unbelief was not to be found in these, but in their own unconquerable prejudices, which rendered it impossible that they could be his flock. He did tell them also that his Father was above all, and that He and his Father were one. This they called blasphemy, and would have stoned him, but he showed them their ignorance of the Scriptures, pointing out that if inspired men of old, in whom the Spirit dwelt, were called gods, much more might he a *son* that character, even according to the proper interpretation of these, on whom his works showed that the Spirit of God so fully rested. This was an evidence which they could not resist, and should have found themselves constrained to believe that God was in Him, and He in God. His works justified him in saying thus much, but they were determined to use the argument of force, and endeavoured again to apprehend him. This work, however, was not done, and he walked forth unharmed.

The Dedication rejoicings were now over, and this state of the popular mind in Jerusalem was not favourable for the impartial reception of the truth. We may remark, besides, that Christ, as far as is recorded, never stopped in that faithless and fore-doomed city longer than the legal period of the festival. We cannot say whether he had honoured this feast every year in its annual return, but his doing it on the present occasion was giving the high sanction of his approval to the human institution ordained by the pious and valiant warrior in defence of the law, in days of

dismay and danger. But the days of his earthly labours and painful pilgrimage were now short, and he had not visited, for any permanent period, the country of Perea. He went first to Bethabara, where John had baptized him, and given testimony to his character. It is probable that this country of rugged mountains and lowly valleys enjoyed the benefit of his doctrines, accompanied with the evidence of his miraculous power, for several months. With Macknight, therefore, in whose judicious erudition and patient labour we place the most confidence, we shall assign the following parts of his history to this locality:—Many came to hear his doctrines, and to witness his miracles; and, comparing his conduct with the testimony of John and their own observation, they believed in Him. From the circumstances of his having to repeat many of the same doctrines and arguments which he had inculcated in other parts, we find a natural recurrence of similarity in the prejudices of the people, and of the same, or similar reasoning, made use of to remove or meet them. Here, at the request of some of his disciples, he again, as he had done in his Sermon on the Mount, taught them how to pray—gave them the form and subjects of prayer, and, by several striking instances drawn from their own observation and experience, enforced importunity in prayer. In the things of this world, men use perseverance and patient entreaty to obtain a favour of which they feel the want—a father, when his son, pressed by hunger, requests bread, would not be so unnatural as to give him a scorpion. They had a compassionate heavenly Father, and they had wants which He alone could supply; upon Him, therefore, they should perseveringly wait with the petition of importunate faith, though He might see it necessary to try that faith by long refusal, or by seeming denial.

Even in this land of the wilderness, his spies and enemies found him out. He, had cast out a devil, who had exerted his evil influence in making the demoniac dumb. They adduced their old objection, that it was done in collusion with the devils themselves, who, as they said, cunningly acknowledged him as the Messiah, for the advancement of their own evil purposes. The baffled objectors disseminated these absurdities in secret; but He who knew their crafty malice answered them openly, by showing the obvious inconsistency of supposing that Satan could so foolishly work to the overthrow of his own power—appealing, withal, to those of their own exorcists, who, by making use of his name, had shown its power. This was taking a fair advantage of their own favourite mode, of late, of bringing him into a hopeless dilemma. They had abused it, sophistically and hypocritically—he turned it against them with the utmost fairness. He came to teach doctrines, and inculcate a morality, which was altogether spiritual and perfect—he appealed to the authority of God, as that by which alone he wrought, and for whose honour alone he taught, and threw the burden of the proof upon them, to demonstrate how the kingdom of Satan could be advanced by such means. With awful justice, he carried the warfare of aggressive argument home to their own consciences, and made them aware that they were placing themselves in the predicament into which they wished to thrust him. He had proved to them that he had the power of commanding and expelling these spirits of evil—he had preached to them the truth of light, and of promised liberty and deliverance—if they would not listen, if they would not open their eyes, if they would not accept of his offer of deliverance, their last state would be far worse than their first. These were arguments to which they durst not, and could not, answer.—The female mind is quick in perceiving, and the heart of woman is naturally adapted to feel, such home appeals; and we need scarcely mention the parenthetical exclamation of the woman who broke out, in rapturous exclamation, of

the happiness which the mother of such a Teacher must enjoy. He denied not its truth, but pointed to a higher happiness, destined for those who heard and obeyed the word of God.

It is curious, we should rather say instructive, to observe how nearly prejudices follow the same erroneous mode of justifying themselves. The proof from Christ's power over the thrones and dominions of darkness had before been exhibited, and been inefficient. So was it now. As on the former occasion, the unwilling convicts of unreasonable prejudice and hypocrisy demur to the convincing power of such evidence, and will have their own favourite test of a sign from heaven. There was no means of arguing against such hypocrisy—of convincing such willingly blind obstinacy, but only to tell them, as he had done before, that they should have their sign, to their own confusion and destruction—the sign of the prophet Jonah. He concluded the whole of this argumentative interview with a strong and warning appeal to that “candle of the Lord,” the faculty of reason, which God had placed within them. If they made a right use of that, they would clearly discern the light of heaven—if, through their inveterate prejudices, they should abuse it, the life-giving truth of God would be converted by themselves, and to themselves, into the most hopeless spiritual darkness.

One of the very common modes which the Pharisees employed to entrap our Saviour unawares, or to get a valid ground of accusation against him, was to invite him to their houses, and to entertain him with apparent hospitality. We do not maintain that all invitations of the kind given by them were equally insincere, and with the same wicked motive. At times, it seems to have been out of curiosity; on other occasions, it was most probably with the design of gaining him over to their party, by a show of kindness, should it so turn out that He was in reality the Messiah. We do not learn that our Saviour ever refused to accept of their invitations, though well aware of their evil or selfish designs. He went, not however to flatter or to enjoy the honours or luxuries of their feasts. On these occasions, as well as on others, he spoke the truth, in pursuance of his great mission, and openly proclaimed the hypocrisy of their character. Here, in Perea, as elsewhere, he was repeatedly asked by these proud and hypocritical men to their houses. On the first of these meetings, the entertainer, as usual, marvelled that Christ did not wash, or bathe himself, after leaving the multitudes, and before eating. The Teacher of true spiritual morality, after justifying himself, and exposing the vain hollowness of their ceremonial *perfection*, pronounced a severe judgment upon the whole principles of their system, which, in their practice, he showed, consisted in a scrupulous exactness in minor trifles, but really led the mind to a neglect of the essential virtues of the law of righteousness—love to God, and justice and charity to men. All their vain parade of sanctified formality was only like the gaudy ornaments of the charnel-house—all their pretended moral purity was the pollution of “graves which appear not,” which men walk over unawares, and are defiled.* In this general and severe censure he included the doctors of the law also, who would have claimed exemption. They were punctual, to the extreme of supererogation, in imposing burdensome rites and severe exactions upon others, while they were the least exemplary

* The graves or monuments of the rich were expensively adorned, and carefully kept in repair, and white-washed and beautified, but those of the poor were allowed to fall into neglect; and if the stones which marked their place of repose were buried by time, or overthrown, a stranger might, unawares, walk over them, which, according to the Jews, polluted the individual, however deep the bones were buried, or however long they had mouldered there.

in complying themselves. Their fathers slew the prophets, and they justified their deeds by erecting monuments to point out the fact, while they treated all other prophets sent to them no better than their fathers had done. They had corrupted the revealed doctrine of their ancient prophets—they had perverted the law of God, and not walking in its statutes themselves, had excluded all who looked up to them for instruction from the kingdom of God. Such being the men, it is no wonder that this just unmasking of their false and hypocritical pretences still more excited their malice and enmity. We are told that they began to urge him vehemently, and to provoke him to expose himself in his words, that they might lay hold upon some plausible grounds of accusation.

He heeded them not, but discharged his duty in public as before, instructing the immense multitudes that pressed around him. He had not feared to describe in their true colours the character of the Pharisees to their face, and he now loudly warned the multitudes and his own disciples to beware of the deceit of their usurping teachers—to act in such a manner that all their thoughts and words might bear the light and scrutiny of the day of eternal truth. He encouraged his disciples against falling away from their profession through the fear of men, who could inflict only temporal death, and to put their trust in God, who holds the life of all in his hands—to fear Him who condemns, according to the unchangeable laws of his kingdom, to eternal death, and the terrible tortures of everlasting fire.

While he was thus boldly preaching the truth of his spiritual kingdom, an individual of the crowd—whether urged to it by his relentless enemies, we are left to conjecture—requested him to use his influence with his brother, to persuade him, or command him, to divide the inheritance left by their father. But he was not come, like Moses, to enact or to administer civil laws, and refused to assume the character of a judge, in deciding which of the two was in the wrong, or in compelling the exercise of distributive justice, or punishing for its neglect or transgression. But he took occasion, from this exhibition of a covetous mind, to warn all his hearers against that dangerous vice, illustrating the folly of trusting for happiness in the possession of such unsatisfying and uncertain riches, by the striking parable of the man whose fields had produced an exuberant abundance of the riches of the earth, and who sat down to the thoughtless enjoyment of pleasure, on the very eve when his soul was to be required of him, when the possession of all the wealth and power of the world would have been of no avail. He instructed them first to secure the great end of their existence—the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven; he warned them of the necessity of constant watchfulness and preparation, by the example of servants waiting for the return of their master from a feast, and of the diligent steward in his lord's absence. Foreseeing the fierce storm of persecution and cruelty which was so darkly lowering, and so rapidly approaching, he told them that his coming to such a world was like sending fire, and sword, and division. They looked for universal dominion and universal tranquillity over the earth, under the dominion of the Prince of peace, but instead of that, he told them that the establishment of his kingdom would take place in the suffering of cruelty and persecution. But they would form a very false judgment of the character of God, if they supposed that those who fell in such a cause were objects of his displeasure. They thought that those Galileans whom Pilate had slain in the act of sacrificing, and those others upon whom the tower of Siloam had fallen, were direct objects of the Divine vengeance for their guilt; he cautioned them against forming harsh and unjust judgments upon others, and urged rather to use such

events as pressing motives to repentance, lest the coming troubles of the terrible crisis should cut them off unprepared. The present was a time of patient waiting and probation whether they would repent; but if, like the fig-tree, which remained still barren after all the care and patience of the gardener, they bore no fruit, they also should be rooted out of the garden of God as useless cumberers of the ground.

We might have supposed that the many times Jesus had justified himself for performing deeds of mercy on the Sabbath-day, by most conclusive reasoning from the law and practice of the Jews themselves, as well as from the nature of the act of compassion itself, and of the purpose of the day of rest, would have satisfied them of their own superstitious abuse of it, and put an end to all cavilling. But it was not so. Even the learned men of the nation were blinded against reason and mercy by the gloomy spirit of superstition, and cavilled on as before. It was those chiefly who ought to have been free from the dominion of prejudice who were most under its influence, for the multitudes were open to conviction by the demonstrations of power and wisdom which he gave. Twice is he reported to have wrought miraculous cures in Perea on this day—once in the synagogue on a woman, “a daughter of Abraham bound by Satan, and bowed together for eighteen years;” and a second time, on a man who was dropsical, in the house of a Pharisee. They could make a convenient exception for themselves, and lead their ox or ass to the water, or lift them out of a ditch when they had fallen into it on the day of holy rest, but they had no sympathy with him, and could find no excuse for his conduct, who, by an incalculably higher exercise of charity, restored strength to the one, and soundness to the other, by a word and a touch. We need not wonder that the hypocritical censurers were ashamed in the one case, and that they could not answer his reasoning in the other; but unless we had known the invincible power of prejudice, and the blind obstinacy of hostility to the truth, we might well wonder that they should still continue to rail, and to object on the same grounds.

Jesus had now travelled to the utmost bounds of the country on the East possessed by the people chosen of God, and having pointed out the path of truth to all the lost sheep of the house of Israel, he was returning and journeying slowly toward Jerusalem. But it was not an idle or a secret journey—he taught over all the cities and villages. The subjects of his doctrine were of course the same as those which the Evangelists had recorded before, and probably in language somewhat similar, for they are not detailed. One question, inspired by a natural but unprofitable curiosity, is mentioned by Luke, with our Lord’s answer, in regard to the numbers that are to be saved. It is not clear whether the querist meant it in a temporal or a spiritual sense, in regard to those that are to be admitted into the Messiah’s kingdom on earth or in heaven. Christ answers it altogether in the spiritual sense, without regard to their notions of temporal dominion, and the condition of the conquered heathen under the reign of Messiah, and diverting the attention of men from such unprofitable speculations, urges every one to use all exertions to secure an entrance for himself—that the Jews were not idly to rest in their imagined privileges, as if they were secure of an entrance by hereditary right. Upon such self-confident presumers on their being favourites of God, the time was coming fast when the gate of admission should be shut, and it would be hopeless then to urge the possession of those privileges, of which they had made no proper use. It would only aggravate their remorse and their woe, when they beheld the multitudes of those Gentiles whom they now despised, gathered from every region under heaven, and sitting down to the feast of the celestial paradise with Abraham, and

Isaac, and Jacob, while they were rejected and excluded. Many a time had Jesus thus to humble the spiritual pride of the Jews, and to instruct their ignorant contempt of the Gentiles.

If the multitudes who eagerly crowded to hear the teaching of Jesus inspired the Pharisees with envy and hate, the circumstance also gave umbrage and alarm to the jealous and guilty Herod. He might, indeed, have sent forth his soldiers to apprehend and imprison Jesus, or put him to death, as he had done the Baptist. But it would seem that remorse for that crime of revengeful tyranny still haunted his guilty soul. He would not, therefore, add torments to his sleepless and accusing conscience, by again embruing his hands in guiltless blood. He readily joined the Pharisees, however, in a plot to urge on that event which they were so anxious to accomplish. Though a Sadducee himself, he made these specious hypocrites the bearers of a message which they delighted to execute. They warned Jesus to depart thence, for that Herod had resolved to kill him. Herod and they knew that there was no other place of refuge for him but Judea, where he had numerous enemies, sufficiently relentless and unscrupulous to put that threat in execution. He who could easily have defied the crafty tyrant's power, and baffled the malice of his enemies, let them know that he fully understood the character and motive of both. He sent them back with a message to "that fox," that he was resolved to pursue his course, and do his deeds of mercy, in defiance of all threat. But that course would soon be finished—that work would soon be accomplished. He also let them understand that he saw their designs in wishing to drive him to the wicked city of Jerusalem, where the authority and commission of prophets ought alone to be judged—where alone they ought to have been most rapturously welcomed, and most highly honoured—but where, for so long a time, they had been all rejected and murdered. But though knowing, as he did, their relentless malice, and that those who had often attempted to stone, and apprehend and murder him, were soon about to consummate their guilty intentions, he poured forth the most pathetic lamentation ever uttered by the lips of man upon the hopeless infidelity of that city, over which the protection of God had been so often thrown—to which his offers of mercy had been so frequently and so unavailingly renewed. But that the time was soon coming, very contrary to their expectation, when their temple, the earthly palace of their heavenly King, should be laid desolate, and that they should never see Him, their Messiah, till they should return in faith, and say, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

We have no reason to be astonished that such malicious enemies, such shameless hypocrites, should still retain their relentless hostility; but, after all the proofs which Jesus had given that he knew all their most secret thoughts and intentions, we may be astonished that they should still pretend to assume the mask of hospitality and candour in regard to his doctrines. But though they might have concluded that all power was possessed by Him who had given such miraculous displays of it, and all knowledge by Him who had pierced through all the folds of their sanctimonious garb of specious profession, and who feared not to rebuke and silence them in their pride of power and arrogant authority; still, in the external demeanour, and in the poor and peaceable followers of the meek and lowly Jesus of Nazareth, there was nothing to terrify or overawe. Yet, he was again asked to dinner by a Pharisee, who was one of the chief rulers of the great council of the nation, and who had, probably, a few months before sat in judgment to condemn and put him to death. Here, however, all is smooth complaisance, and conde-

ascending kindness, and though Jesus saw the malice of Satanic guile in those seemingly friendly smiles, and the dagger of the assassin hid under the sacred phylacteries of those flowing robes, he accepted the offer of apparent friendship, requiting it with a higher philanthropy than this world could ever exhibit. Many of the wise and the learned men, all of high fame for religion and zeal, were invited; but it was not to listen with the docility of disciples, or sincere inquirers, to the word and wisdom of God—it was to watch, with the cunning of bitterest foes, every word and act of the wonderful guest whom they pretended to have met for the purpose of honouring. It was on the Sabbath-day, and they had here introduced the individual bloated with the dropsy, mentioned a little above. Their sophistical arguments were all anticipated and answered by Him who knew their object, and the man, with a touch, the slightest surely of all menial work, walked away in the freshness of elastic health. Foiled in argument, and in the comprehension of the principle of their own laws, they could not answer, they could not raise a ground of definite censure. It might have been a matter of curious study to us now, if the conversation of these learned and holy judges of the land, and doctors of the law, had been recorded, in contrast with the wisdom of that Teacher whom they had met to judge and condemn, but who had met them to pity and instruct. He condescended even to give instructions in regard to matters of civil politeness in social intercourse. Remarking the zealous rivalry of selfish and ambitious men, who, even there, would strive for seats of honour, he gave them a lesson, to show that humility of mind was the most pleasant and most honourable path to distinction. He had come thither with a thorough knowledge of the cause that had assembled all those proud hearts and haughty looks, and though he was aware that he was as a dove among vultures, or a lamb among wolves, he gave full scope to that gentle and convincing wisdom of parabolic figure which glides quietly into the mind and conviction, without outraging the prejudices which it is intended to remove. He taught hospitality, but it was not of that selfish and exclusive kind which he witnessed there—it was that which invited the poor and the maimed, and the blind also, to participate of the superabundance of those comforts which the Father of all had given. These poor pensioners of God could not recompense the giver of the feast for participating in what was otherwise the refuse of needless profusion, but their blessing would bring down the blessing of the compassionate Father of the poor and destitute; and the considerate and benevolent dispenser of such charity would be recompensed a thousand-fold in participating of that feast of eternal pleasure which would be set before those who should arise in the resurrection of the righteous. The commanding power of that eloquent wisdom of love and compassion seems to have inspired a new and unwonted feeling into that company of jealous and envious formalists. For the time it opened up a new world of ideas and of hopes to men whose thoughts and wishes, all religious and holy as they pretended to be, were based upon the materiality of visible enjoyments, and centred upon carnal hopes. One of the listening audience exclaimed, “Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.” This was a vague and sensual aspiration at the best; and we may safely conclude, from the striking parable to which it gave occasion, that it was the contracted and false expectation of a bigoted Jew, who expected that the chosen people of God, from the days of old, were alone to participate in that felicity. In the present instance, Jesus evidently proceeded upon a systematic method of bringing the truth before these men of form and ceremonial system. He commenced with facts and arguments, drawn from daily observation, to confirm

the rectitude of his own conduct, the purity of his own principles. From this he proceeds "to the little morality" of social manners; from that to the great leading principle of moral conduct—universal benevolence to all. He finally rises to the illustration of the grand principle upon which God deals with all, and in those general terms of the parable, sets forth the grounds of the whole economy of that moral government, in the progressive administration of which, He has made himself known, in all his character, to his intelligent moral offspring of this world. This he does in the very powerful and striking parable of the marriage supper, in which he sets forth the peculiar favour which had, in the first instance, been shown to the Jews—the carnal and selfish motives and reasons which had made them reject the invitation—the determined purpose of God to make known his own goodness, in calling the despised Gentiles from the highways and hedges, by the urgency of hospitable compulsion. This allegory set forth the conduct and character of the Jews in an attitude of infatuated folly, which, we might conceive, was altogether impossible to be realized in the living manners of the world. For even the most favoured and exalted subjects to refuse, upon trifling and groundless pretexts, the honour of attending the marriage-feast of their sovereign's son, we would think an absurdity that could not be realized. And certainly it could not, but still the folly and obstinate pride of the Jews was more inexcusable, and more wonderful. The honour to which they were raised was infinitely greater—the urgency of the condescending grace and kindness was inconceivably more astonishing. It was all displayed before them with a demonstration of goodness and compassion, which we might have thought no obstinacy of unbelief or prejudice could withstand, and yet, repeated though it was in many a form, they realized and exhibited that folly, while it was so strongly represented to their minds and convictions.

This high tone of authority, assumed boldly in presence of the highest dignitaries, and most learned doctors of their nation, and such language listened to by them without reply, or the power of reply, seems again to have excited the ardent expectations of his disciples and followers, of an immediate and decided assumption of power on his part. Therefore, to check this false expectation, he again cautioned them in regard to the conditions of his discipleship—that they should be prepared to leave all their earthly possessions, to break loose from the dearest ties that would interfere with their duty—in a word, to lay their account with accompanying him to death. He enforced this previous calculation of consequences, by instances drawn from the example of the world, where the obvious relation of the means to the end are never forgot. No man commences an expensive building without computing whether he is able to finish it—no king provokes a hostile invasion unless he knows that he has forces adequate to repel the armies of the foe. In like manner, if they did not seriously weigh beforehand all that he said to them of the difficulties and trials of the life of his disciples, they would certainly be discouraged when they saw all their unfounded expectations disappointed.

Jesus, who refused not to enter the halls of the haughty, and who feared not to humble their pride by telling them the reality of their characters, condescended with greater pleasure to impart the consolations of hope, and the full truth of the gospel, to the detested publican, to the repentant sinner, to enter their houses, and to eat with them. Such conduct was too favourable a ground of censure and popular objection not to be urged by the Pharisees. If they had been truly zealous themselves, they would have done the same thing—if they had possessed true religion, they would have been delighted at seeing Jesus communicate its doctrines,

and inculcate its principles, upon those who so much needed such instruction. On the contrary, they not only despised, they also condemned him as a sinner, and represented him as seeking sinful enjoyments in such society. He justified his conduct by explaining the reasons which led him to it—giving beautiful illustrations from the common principles of human prudence, and the natural feelings of the human heart in analogous circumstances. A shepherd who has lost one sheep out of a numerous flock shows more anxiety about it, and rejoices more upon its recovery, than over the rest which had not strayed. So is it in heaven among the angels over an erring sinner who has repented and returned. A poor woman, who has lost one piece out of her narrow store of silver, is more anxious to recover it than delighted with what she still retains, and uses more diligence to search for it, and rejoices when she adds it again to her wealth;—such is the ground of the angels' joy in the presence of God over the repentant sinner. These are common and easily understood feelings. The next illustration is one of the most beautiful and touchingly pathetic that ever embodied, in speaking form, the inextinguishable love and compassion of God to sinful man. It is the character and conduct of the prodigal son—the misery and shame brought upon him by his own folly and debauchery after he had left his father's house—the sorrow and repentance which the consequences of that folly awaken in his heart—his return, in the depth of degradation and sorrow, to his offended parent—the rapturous joy of that affectionate father at the recovery of the erring and lost one—the honour he bestows upon the returned penitent, whom he welcomes as one come from the grave. The whole lecture is true to nature, in the best and most amiable exhibition of the affections of the heart. Such is it in the natural working of the affectionate heart of a human father—such also is it with the Father of all when his erring and sinful children return. What then does the conduct of the Pharisees resemble, who saw nothing to approve, but every thing to censure, in the condescension of Him who took delight in finding out such wanderers, and leading them back to peace, and love, and happiness? What but the grumbling discontent of that callous-hearted and selfish son and brother, who would rather have seen his father go sorrowing to the grave, and his unhappy brother wandering in wretchedness, than have had his own envious disposition embittered by such ecstatic happiness. So much deeper and more sincere was the compassion of Christ than that of the strictest and most zealous sect of the Jews—so much purer were the motives of his zeal than theirs.

It does not appear that such a striking representation of that truth, which they ought to have fully known, made any impression upon them, or excited the slightest remorse; but their callous hearts, so hardened against the appeals of his gospel of mercy, greatly grieved him. If they rioted in wealth and sensual indulgence, and walked proudly in the eyes of men, they cared not who perished in poverty, or were cut off in their sins. Christ, therefore—by the example of the unjust and rapacious steward, who being accused, and called to give an account of his conduct, by his crafty policy diverted the storm of destruction that threatened him, by making friends of the debtors and tenants whom he had oppressed and plundered—taught his disciples what use they were to make of the riches of this world. Not that Jesus commended the conduct of that steward, whom he expressly calls unjust, but he had made a prudent use of his means to the attainment of his end, and his followers, by employing their wealth in relieving the destitute, and turning the sinner from the evil of his ways, would obtain the approval of God, and of the Saviour, who would count it as kindness done to himself—who would requite it by bestowing upon them the

true riches, by securing them mansions of peace and joy, when the riches of this world, in which men trust, shall have vanished for ever.

The Pharisees, with supercilious pride, instead of being convinced, mocked at these instructions, which, they knew, were partly directed against them. Christ, therefore, tells them more directly, that all the specious show of their profession was only abomination in the sight of God—that all their boasted privileges of descent from Abraham, and of the knowledge of the law, would not stand them instead. The Gospel was now begun, and Gentile as well as Jew would be accepted. To awaken them still farther, he sets before them the danger and certain consequence of their carnal security and sensual indulgence, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus—the one enjoying the full abundance of the temporal blessings of God here, but unmindful of him; the other, the apparent object of his severest displeasure, but a believing son of Abraham, and patiently submitting to the will of God. But, in eternity the picture is reversed—Lazarus is reclining on the bosom of Abraham, at the feast of heaven, and the other tortured on the restless bed of consuming fire. No longer does the Epicurean Sadducee doubt of the existence of spirits, or of the immortality of the soul; he is represented as beseeching Abraham to send a warning apparition to his brethren; but is told, that in Moses and the Prophets they had evidence enough to lead them to faith in the revelation of God. If they did not believe these, there was no hope that they would be persuaded by the sight of an unsubstantial shadow from the land of spirits. In many such striking discourses as these did he reprove the obstinate unbelief of the Pharisees, and confirm the faith, and instruct the minds, of his disciples.

While he was thus engaged, a message was brought from the affectionate family of Bethany, that Lazarus was sick. Instead, however, of repairing immediately thither, and relieving the distress of those friends whom he loved so tenderly, or even giving forth his word of power, to arrest the progress of the disease, he continued where he was two days. But, when he knew that the spirit of him whom he so loved had left the lifeless body, he called his disciples to accompany him into the land of Judea again, that he might awaken him from that sleep of death. They, knowing the attempts which had been made upon his life, when he was last there, wondered that he should so soon risk a similar danger, but resolved to go and die with him, if it should be necessary. They crossed to the west of Jordan, and, passing through the country of Samaria, he was besought by ten lepers to have compassion, and heal them. He told them to go and show themselves to the priest. As they went, the miraculous power effected the cure, and one of them, a Samaritan, filled with joyful gratitude, returned, and, falling at the feet of his divine Benefactor, thanked him for the compassion which he had shown. The other nine Jews were destitute of such feelings, and, though they might have believed in his power to perform the cure, had not come to the necessary conclusion, that He who exerted it was from God, and that his doctrines were divine. Such want of gratitude for so glorious a deliverance from a loathsome disease, which was held in peculiar abhorrence among the Jews, and subjected them to grievous hardships, in being excluded from all society as unclean, was particularly gross, and met with the censure of Jesus. They who possessed the knowledge of the truth, ought to have been of a better spirit than the ignorant Samaritan, who received the approbation of Him who knew the hearts and motives of all. It appears that it was of design that Jesus journeyed slowly on this occasion, notwithstanding he knew the anguish and disappointed hopes of his affectionate friends.

But he was about to work a miracle, which, to outward appearance, should far transcend any that his followers or the Jews had yet witnessed. The daughter of Jairus had newly fallen asleep on the pillow of death, when the spirit of life was commanded to return; the son of the widow of Nain was carrying to his place of final rest, when his eyes were again opened upon the land of the living. But before Jesus had reached Bethany, Lazarus had been dead at least five days.* We need not relate, in detail, the very pathetic interview which the compassionate Jesus had with the bereaved and disconsolate sisters—the natural expression of deep regret at his absence—their hopes, and doubts, and fears, as to the object of his now coming, when the hand of corruption was already rapidly marring those unconscious features upon which they had so often gazed with sisterly affection. We need not attempt to describe that deep sympathy in human suffering and woe, which drew sighs and tears from Him who had all power, and who was so soon to convert their sorrow into the raptures of unexampled joy. Awe, and fearful expectation, must have been raised to the highest pitch in that anxious crowd of sympathizing friends and mourners, and the multitude of more curious and jealous spectators, when the stone was rolled away from the dark mouth of the house of death—when the trembling sisters were called upon to believe, and see the glorious power of God—when those eyes which pierced the secrets of the human heart were raised to heaven, and that voice, which commanded all the elements of nature to obedience, was sent up in grateful prayer and thanksgiving to the Father of mercy—the Hearer of prayer. That voice was heard and answered—that command, also, which at last will awake the slumbering ashes of all generations, was heard through the invisible regions of the world of souls. “Lazarus, come forth!” That unconscious mass of clay with which the worm of corruption was busy, from which the noisome smell of the grave was already tainting the upper air, walks forth, wrapped in the swathing garb of the tomb. Fear, and doubt, and joy, must have been strangely blended in that silent crowd, till those cerements and tight bandages should disclose the nature of those features which they had been intended to hide for ever. Those that loosed them must have seen and felt that putrifying decay had already taken place; and when they, and all the spectators, contrasted the appearance of the grave-clothes with the living wonder and joy in the countenance of their departed, but now returned friend, no language can depict the mingled feelings which must have possessed their breasts.

No wonder that many of the Jews felt themselves constrained to believe on one who had shown such unquestionable divine power. We may conceive it possible, that they who had heard of his previous miracles, or seen some of them, might have been under such prejudice, or have had their understanding so perverted by the sophistical reasonings of the priests and scribes, as to think it possible that they might be the work of magic. But when they witnessed Jesus make a direct appeal to God, and show that He held the keys of death and the grave, their prejudices yielded, and they believed that He was in truth the Messiah. Not so, however, with the priests and the Pharisees. They soon heard of this miracle from some of the spectators, and immediately summoned a council to deliberate what was to be done. They pretended no longer now to doubt of the reality of the miracles of Jesus, as

* In our translation, Martha is made to say, that Lazarus had been *dead* four days. But every one acquainted, in the slightest degree, with the original, knows that the word she uses should have been translated more properly—he has been four days *here*, or in this state; and the Jews took at least one day to embalm and prepare for burial.

they had done hitherto; but, instead of this convincing them that he was sent from God, they resolved to make it the very ground upon which they should proceed against him. Still, however, with all their perverse hypocrisy and murderous policy, they pretended that it was zeal for their religion, and true patriotism in the cause of their country—"All men will believe in him, and the Romans will destroy our temple and our nation." We are told by John, that many of the rulers believed on him; and it would appear that some of them had urged a faint defence, as before, that they should not condemn any one without legal proof of guilt. But the bloody policy of Caiaphas prevailed, and it was resolved that they should put Jesus instantly to death, as the teacher of a new religion. John remarks that the high priest, speaking officially, like the priests of old, in their sacred robes, and with the breastplate of the Urim and Thummim, was inspired by God, and uttered a prophetic truth, when he said that it was necessary that "one man should die, rather than that all the people should perish." Yes, one man did die, that all the people might believe and be saved; but that people and their rulers would not believe—they rejected the counsel of God against their own souls—their own counsel and the wisdom of their ancients were turned to foolishness and confusion, and those Romans, whom they falsely pretended to propitiate, were made the very instruments, in the hand of God, to raze to the ground that proud and gorgeous temple in which they trusted, and to trample in the dust the might of that nation which they expected to raise to universal dominion; and all this, from their own bigotry and superstition.

This resolution was known to Jesus, but as the Passover, at which he was to offer himself up as a voluntary sacrifice for that disobedient and unbelieving people, was not yet come, he left the grateful family whom he had lifted from the depth of affliction to the height of happiness, and retired with his disciples to the city of Ephraim, at a considerable distance from Jerusalem, and near the wilderness. While he remained here, the Pharisees put a question to him, which it was really important for them to understand—"When the kingdom of God should come?" He was now near the end of his labours, and the time was approaching fast when that kingdom was to be erected, therefore he spoke explicitly and plainly. He told them, that that kingdom should not be established, as they expected, by the triumphal descent of a conquering prince, with the exterminating power of the sword wielded against his enemies—that the principles of that kingdom were spiritual, and dwelt in the heart. But he told his disciples, that the coming of that kingdom, and of the Son of man, should be accompanied with terrible calamities, and sudden desolation, as the flood came on the regardless generation in the days of Noah—as the fire of heaven upon the abandoned city of Sodom. The Jews would be sunk in sinful security as to the true means of deliverance, and looking after many false Christs, while the eagles of Roman desolation should be gathering around them. He therefore urged his disciples, by many examples and parables, to watch and pray earnestly, that the vengeance, in which the Jewish state was certainly to fall, should not overtake them. While many would mock and ask, "Where was the promise of his coming?" they should rest in the certain hope of deliverance and escape. By way of reproof to those proud questioners, he concluded with the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, in which he shows, that humility and a true feeling of unworthiness are more acceptable in the sight of God than that self-confident spirit of righteousness, which made the Pharisees conceive that they were the only favourites of heaven, the only individuals among the Jews worthy of being honoured

by the approbation of the Messiah. While here, his indefatigable enemies endeavoured to ensnare Jesus in difficulties, in regard to the law of divorce ; but he condemning, as he had always done, this practice, as having its origin in their own licentious lusts, referred them to the original law of God. From the case of Herod and his brother Philip, to which we alluded, and the prevalence of gross abuse in this respect, which they considered a *privilege* of their liberty, it was very necessary that the true Lawgiver should lay down the law of God definitely, that this terrible source of crime and sin should for ever be shut up among Christians. Marriage is sanctioned by God, and can only be broken by the grossest transgression of one of the parties. The disciples, still imbued with the prejudice of the false doctrines which they had learned, and led astray in their sentiments by the corrupt practices of their countrymen, conceived this a harsh bondage ; but Jesus declared the law of God against their prejudice, and by taking numbers of little children, which were brought to him, in his arms, and blessing them, declaring that of such alone was the kingdom of heaven, inculcated on his disciples the necessity of humbly receiving what they could not yet embrace cordially, or fully understand.

After a short stay in this city, he again turned toward Jerusalem. As he went, he was applied to, in apparently sincere terms, by a young ruler, who ascribed to him the epithet "good," and requested to know what he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus saw his state of mind, appreciated his motives, and giving a right turn to his thoughts, made him, in the first place, understand that none but God was entitled to be called "good," in its true sense. He then directed him to the commands of the law, as the way to eternal life. This was another step in the process of conviction, for he was aware that the young man believed that he had given compliance to all the law. When, therefore, he gave the answer which he anticipated, that he might show how far the spirit of that law of perfect obedience extended, he told the ruler that one thing still was wanting—he must sell his extensive possessions, distribute all to the poor, and follow him in the hope of the happiness of heaven. This test of obedience proved too severe—he could not, at the command of one whom he believed a divine Teacher, relinquish the riches of time for the treasures of eternity. The criterion was applied to prove to his own conviction that the love of the world was too much in his heart to permit him to be a disciple of Christ. After his departure, Jesus explained to his disciples how the spirit of covetousness, the love of riches, and trust and complaisance in the power and pleasure of the world, operated in the heart against the love of holiness. The apostles, who were astonished at this demand of their Master, and who seem to have been anxious that one of such wealth and influence had joined them, reminded him that they had left all to follow him. This was not literally exact, for Peter and the rest still retained their houses and fishing-boats by the lake of Galilee ; but Jesus took their devotion in its honest and full extent, and assured them, that they should be rewarded a hundred-fold for all their temporal losses and distresses. But lest they should again misinterpret, as they had done so often, that these thrones of judgment over the tribes, and power over the world, were merely honours and dignities of this earth, and exclusively to be assigned to them as Jews, he delivered the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, by which he showed them that the Gentiles, who were to be called last, should be rewarded as liberally as those who had received the first engagement.

They had got frequent intimations that this Passover to which they were now going, was to be the last to which they were to accompany their Master. But as

Jews, they were strangely perplexed between the threats of violence on the part of the powerful rulers of their nation, their own small numbers, and feeble resources, and the glory of that reign which they were confident was about to commence. He therefore took the twelve aside, and again explained to them the prophecies concerning the Messiah, and assured them that he should be betrayed, and delivered up to the Gentiles, condemned, and scourged, and put to death, and would arise again on the third day. Plain as this declaration was, they understood it not. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, with their mother, worshipped him, and entreated the first places of honour in that kingdom, which they assured themselves was finally to be erected after his resurrection. He told them that such honour was to be attained only by following in the path of suffering which he trode, and that God would afterwards bestow that honour upon those who were worthy of exercising it. But to humble the pride of earthly ambition, and allay those envies and jealousies which the mistaken petition had excited among the rest, he told them that the places of honour in his kingdom were very different from the military or civil honours of the Gentile sovereignties—the Son of man came not to set up the gorgeous pomp of an earthly monarchy, but to be the servant and minister of all; and that he who aimed at being the greatest among them should condescend to be the most humble minister, the most laborious and patient servant of all.

In passing through Jericho, he was earnestly besought by two blind men to restore their sight. His fame was now so great, and his journey so public, that the noise of the crowds announced, to those who could not see, the approach of the Son of David. He gave no alms, as a bribe to gain the applause of liberality, or to relieve, for a short period, the wants of the idle; but he bestowed health and strength upon the sick and feeble, and the use of their senses to those who were deprived of them. He thus enabled multitudes of helpless objects of charity to labour for themselves, and secure an honest independence of the alms of others, which are often so coldly and scantily grudged. He stopped not in the proud and luxurious “city of palm trees,” where he had many enemies, but passed onwards, with the still increasing crowd in his train. Zaccheus, one of the general publicans, or farmers of the public revenue, was anxious to behold one, of whom such wonderful reports were spread, and had run before the crowd, and climbed up into a tree by the wayside. Jesus called him by name, doubtless to the no little astonishment of one who had never met him before, and intimated to the hated publican that he intended that day to stay at his house. This declaration offended the prejudices of the Jews, who looked upon even the best of his class as enemies to God, and hateful to him, as the greatest sinners. Zaccheus was rich and charitable—he gave the half of his large income to feed the poor—he was just in the administration of the law of foreign tribute, to which the Jews were subjected; for if, upon false information, he had imposed an excessive and illegal tax, he returned it fourfold. Yet the whole class was hated, and of him they made no exception. He heard their murmurings, justified himself, by an account of his own practice, which the people must have known; and was justified and approved by Him who knew not only his conduct, but the motives from which it proceeded. His name imports that he was a Jew, and his charity, that he was a faithful son of Abraham—and, therefore, despised and hated as he was, Jesus brought salvation to his house. It was here that Christ delivered the parable of the talents, illustrative of the character of his true and pretended servants, and of his enemies, and of the rule by which he would remunerate the one and punish the other. The circumstance of a king’s son going into a far

country to receive investiture of royal power, and to return, was common in those days, when imperial Rome was mistress of all the countries around. None durst assume the fallen sceptre without the sanction of the reigning Emperor. By this parable, therefore, Jesus intimated that he was about, not to set up a monarchy, but to entrust his servants with commissions of importance, to depart for a time, and then return.

Having given all these instructions, and encouragements, and cautions, he proceeded toward Jerusalem. The expectation of the wondering Jews was now at its highest. Multitudes had already collected in the holy city, for the purpose of purifying themselves before the festival; and knowing the proclamation of the rulers, and being aware of their determined malice and power, they began to think that Jesus would not dare to appear. He, however, no longer sought concealment, and came publicly to the hospitable roof of Lazarus, from which he had been forced a short time before to retire. The kindness of that deeply-obliged and pious family was liberally expended. They made a supper, and we do not now hear of the fretful complaints of Martha, against the more affectionate attentions of her elder sister. To testify that devoted and ardent affection, she poured a costly box of ointment upon his feet, and wiped them with her hair. This "oil of gladness" was a compliment which the rich and the noble poured on the heads of their most honoured guests, and if the circumstances of that grateful family could afford to give such a testimony of their love to Him, who deserved to be more highly honoured than all the sons of men, no one had any good reason to be offended at it. But the covetous mind of Judas could not enter into the beauty and propriety of such feelings. That worshipper of mammon, who bore the purse of the little flock, thought that the price of such an extravagant luxury should rather have been deposited in his *frugal* keeping. But he rested the fault which he found upon a different reason of objection—it ought to have been sold for three hundred pence, and these given to the poor.* John, who mentions the incident, observes, that he cared not for the poor, but was a thief, and intended to apply it to his own use. The circumstance is altogether worthy of remark, because it was through the inlet of his own avaricious mind that the watchful enemy gained entrance, took fiendish possession of his heart, and led him to the commission of the basest crime of which fallen man was ever guilty. Jesus excused the deed, or rather commended the affectionate care of her who had done it, and gently admonished the covetous censurer. At this time of thronging resort to Jerusalem, such a meeting as that between Lazarus and Him who had recalled his spirit from the land of shades could not be long unknown. Multitudes came to see two individuals of whom such wonderful circumstances were told, and seeing, and hearing, and knowing the certainty of the facts, many believed that Jesus was in truth the Messiah. This last circumstance had more effect upon the priests and rulers than the power and wisdom of Jesus—they called their council again, and resolved to put Lazarus to death.†

All this machination of the dignified and powerful of the people did not now

* The penny mentioned is a Roman coin, of value 7½d.; so that the cost of the ointment was L.9, 7s. 6d., which would indicate that the family of Lazarus was not very poor, but rather in comfortable circumstances; which agrees with the respectable Jews visiting his sisters. This would give greater celebrity to the miracle in Jerusalem.

† We may hence conclude, that Lazarus retired with Jesus and the rest of the disciples to Ephraim, and returned to his home only now. But when they got their chief and most dreaded victim into their power, they seem to have overlooked the less important object of their hatred, or he escaped their malice, or we learn from Epiphanius, that Lazarus lived thirty years after the death of Christ.

deter Jesus from going forward in the path of suffering and of glory that lay before him. Next morning, he proceeded from Bethany toward that proud and secure, but guilty and rebellious, city. To inspire his disciples with confidence, he sent them to the neighbouring village of Bethphage, with directions to bring an ass's colt, which they would find bound there, and which the proprietors would allow, when told that Jesus needed its services. Lowly as this triumphal procession was, it had been predicted by Zechariah to take place in such circumstances—"Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass." Such an unwarlike procession could not alarm the jealous pride of the garrisoned night, and iron-clad legions of the procurator of Judea; but it inspired

followers with exulting joy, as if they were now about to see all their fondest wishes and most ambitious hopes fulfilled. When the undoubted Son of David assumed this unwonted state, and the expectant train wound slowly over the Mount of Olives, in sight of the towering walls of that royal city of their ancient kings—in sight of that more gorgeous "palace of the King of kings," whose lofty and unrivalled majesty was upheaved like a mountain of snow to the heavens—whose eastern front, adorned with shields and plates of burnished gold, reflected the rays of the morning sun, when the thoughts of all that they had witnessed of His uncontrolled power—of all that they had heard and believed of the glories of His coming reign, rushed upon their minds, we cannot be surprised that their expectations, as Jews, rose with a spring-tide of exultation and enthusiasm in their simple but still ambitious minds. These fond imaginations their compassionate Master did not check—nay, he seemed for the time to encourage them—for he refused not the homage which the Jews were wont to pay to their warriors and sovereigns of old—they took off their clothes, and laid them under him, without reproof from Him who knew their ambitious meaning. But this was little—the overcrowded city poured forth its thousands to join in the procession. It was now a triumphal entrance in reality—in the enthusiastic exultation of the moment, the many thousands of congregated Israel cast down their clothes in his march—the trees of the exuberantly clad Mount of Olives surrendered the profusion of their vernal riches to celebrate his progress; and any spectator who observed that demonstration of joy, in which all hearts and all voices seemed to be united to welcome that lowly individual, would have concluded, that this indeed was the triumph of Truth—that this was the homage of a high-minded and virtuous nation to worth and merit, which claimed their applauding admiration, not by outward pomp, but by the all-compelling power of felt and acknowledged virtue. Who that had heard that mighty multitude, in triumphant song, exclaiming, "Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord;"—who that had heard them sing that patriotic and prophetic song,* "Hosannah to the Son of David," and thought upon all that had gone before, and all that they knew to be certain, could have thought that all was evanescent as a summer's mist, or a morning dream? But this was no popular homage claimed by the lowly Prince of Peace, by the victorious King of Zion. He knew the unsubstantial and vanishing hollowness of it all, and aimed at far different and higher homage. Still he had his own purpose to buy it, and refused, at the request of some of the envious and hostile Phari-

* These words are taken from the 118th Psalm, and we think it probable, that the disciples and the multitude chanted the whole of the hymn as they descended the western slope of Olivet, in sight of the temple and palaces of Jerusalem.

sees, to damp that joy, to refuse that tribute of enthusiastic acknowledgment. But, though he made use of that natural outburst of the popular enthusiasm, to restrain the deadly intentions of those hypocritical enemies, he made them know how fully he understood its value. While he descended that green hill's side, joyous in the glory of spring, and looked toward the imposing grandeur of that gilded city which God had so long honoured as his chosen and peculiar abode upon earth, the tears of deepest sympathy and pity flowed from the eyes of their rapturously saluted King, when he saw the infidelity of its wicked rulers and unbelieving inhabitants—"If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes." It is a most mysterious struggle between His certain knowledge of the invincible infidelity and foredoomed destruction of that ungrateful people, and the relenting compassion of His human nature. anxious to avert that fate which his Omniscience was compelled to pronounce as the sentence of the irreversible decree of his Father. Proudly and gloriously did that noble city smile in the eye of the vernal sun—securely and contemptuously did those helmed warriors look down from the eagle eyrie of their stronghold, upon that undisciplined multitude who heralded and swelled the advancing pomp of the lowly prophesied King, of whom they knew nothing—and bitterly did those bigoted misinterpreters of their ancient faith and hope feel, as the enthusiastic hosannahs of that joyous multitude, in defiance of them, welcomed the Son of David to the city and palace of his Father. Where is there any tear of sorrow, or sigh of sympathetic grief, but in the eye and heart of Him, who saw, beyond the exulting pageant, those marble palaces and golden spires levelled with the dust, and those chosen children of the promise writhing in hopeless agony under the giant and resistless tread of Divine vengeance, and the instrument the hated and despised Gentile Romans. These were the only few hours of earthly triumph to the anointed Messiah of Israel, and the palms of victory were wet with the dissolving tears of deepest sorrow and pity, over the rebellion and unbelief of those for whose welfare he had laboured so ardently.

Whatever were the proud hopes of his followers as to the result of this triumphant entry—whatever were the expectations of the gathered tribes from Dan to Beersheba—whatever were the fears of priests and rulers, He had no motive but to exhibit, in humility, the power he possessed, and could wield the claim he had, and could assert whenever he chose. At this visit, he is not represented as having given any demonstration of power, or having uttered any of his commanding doctrines—he entered the city, he entered the temple, and in silent and sad contemplation on all that was around and before him, while the overawed and expecting thousands, who had often witnessed his power, and had heard the voice of his convincing wisdom, were idly or anxiously looking on, He passed the hours of the day without farther display or challenge, and at evening retired to the unambitious abode of Bethany.

He came again, next morning, to the city, and, in his way, pronounced a curse on the barren fig-tree, on which he expected to find fruit.* This was emblematical

* There are various species of this tree in Palestine, the fruit of which ripens through the whole of the summer at various periods. The earliest, or the *doccore*, is frequently ripe in March; and the tree which our Saviour cursed, being full of leaves, and having no fruit, though the "time of gathering the figs was not come," fully showed that it was barren, and useless for the service of man. The blasting of this deceitful tree was of course parabolical and significant, as was afterwards shown.

of the specious show of that professionally holy city before him; for when he again entered the temple, he had a second time, as he had once before done at the commencement of his ministry, to purge the "House of prayer for all nations" of the mercenary buyers and sellers, who had made the earthly residence of the God of holiness and justice a den of robbery and extortion. Though sanctioned by civic and sacerdotal authority, they durst make no resistance to Him whose word they felt to be law. He again exerted his miraculous power in curing the maladies of all that were brought before him. It is curious to remark, that the "Hosannahs to the Son of David"—"All hail to the King of Israel," were not now taken up by the overawed crowd, in presence of their rulers and teachers. That fickle crowd were disappointed of the hopes of yesterday, when they had expected to see the banner of their long-wished-for Messiah displayed in triumph over the compelling abomination of the imperial eagles. But the shout was taken up by the children, and it was equally offensive to the priests. He justified them by an appeal to their own prophetic writings, and his enemies had recourse to their usual answer—to seize upon him by violence—but were deterred by the evident admiration of the multitude. He went about his work unharmed, and returned unharmed to Bethany. Again he went to the city, and, in his way, took occasion, from the withering of the fig-tree, to inculcate upon his disciples the efficacy of faith, and persevering prayer. Next day, some Greek or Gentile proselytes requested to be introduced to Jesus. He did see them, and made known to them that the hour was now come when he should be glorified of all, and all ceremonial distinctions should cease. He again foretold his death, as the means of life to all, the cause of glory to God, and to him. In the near prospect of the bitter agony of that terrible contest, he prayed, indeed, that he might be saved from that hour; but, knowing that it was for the triumph to be gained in that hour of darkness that he had come into the world, he raised his voice to his Father, and prayed that he would glorify his name. A third time did the voice of the Almighty come from the throne of eternity, in answer to the prayer of his only Son, in this day of humiliation. By the banks of Jordan, at the commencement of his ministry—on the holy mount, when the glory of Divinity arrayed him in heavenly beauty—and now, when his enemies were drawing the nets of their relentless malice around him, did the voice of the Creator sound in the ear of the creature, and call upon them to listen, to believe, and obey.

While he was telling the people that the time of that glory was now come, and that, notwithstanding their false ideas of the Messiah's temporal reign, he should be taken from them, warning them to enter into the path of truth before the hopeless darkness of night should descend upon them, the high council had been met to deliberate; but, at present, their consultations ended in nothing. The immense multitudes were astonished at his doctrine and miracles; and also, we are told, that many of the chief rulers believed in him. However anxious his enemies were to use violence, and cut him off, either secretly, or in form of pretended law, they durst not yet do it openly. Christ, however, knew that their hour was at hand, and employed his time in declaring again and again the doctrines of his gospel. While thus engaged, a formal deputation of the council came to him, to ask him the nature of the authority which he assumed in purging the temple, and altering the rites imposed by them, and who gave him that authority? What evil use they intended to make of the answer which they expected, is not said. Jesus had often declared his character and object, and appealed to the works done by him, in proof

of his divine authority. To repeat the same again was superfluous, and worse than useless, to men who were determined not to be convinced. He therefore caught them in their own craft, and implicated them in the dilemma which they intended for him, by asking them to decide whether the authority by which John baptized and taught was from heaven, or of men? If they could not decide, then were they not fit for that office of judging of the commission of prophets, which they assumed. If they should answer that John was a prophet, and had his commission of God, then their own question was answered, and Jesus also, to whom John testified, was ordained by God. If they should answer that the Baptist was an impostor, who assumed the character of a divine Teacher, without the divine appointment, they dreaded that the multitude would stone them, for all the people believed in the prophetic office of John. They were therefore compelled to confess their ignorance. Christ, in reproof of this determined unbelief, and to show them that he fully knew their character, and the motives of their conduct, represented these in a series of striking parabolic examples. Their pretended zeal in the service of God was exhibited in the conduct of the son who expressed his willingness to work in his father's vineyard, but did not. He rose higher, and, in the parable of the vineyard let out to wicked husbandmen, who slew all the messengers sent to receive the fruits, he exposed the perverse rebellion of the whole nation, and predicted their merited destruction. In the parable of the marriage supper, which he delivered a second time, he showed the ungrateful and perverse behaviour of the Jews, and the readiness and alacrity with which the Gentiles would embrace the offer. These learned men, who thought to expose the pretensions of Christ, were struck with silent confusion, in presence of the people, and being defeated in their object, retired, with malice unabated, to give an account of their want of success, and to contrive other plots.

We have seen the various sects separately, or in partial combination, attempt to bring Christ into such declarations of opinion as would secure his condemnation, or, as they thought, expose his ignorance. But now these parables being felt as applicable, and intended to be applied to all of them, they united their counsel once more, and made another malevolent effort to accomplish their purpose. Their tools, therefore, came to him feigning great respect, and pretending to have doubts and difficulties about paying the Roman tribute, desiring the opinion of one who had shown such knowledge and independence of spirit. They knew the jealousy and prompt cruelty of the Roman governor—they knew also the bitter reluctance the Jews to pay that tribute, and their confident hope that the Messiah was to deliver them from all appearance of foreign bondage. If he should give an answer either way, that they were bound to pay, or bound patriotically to resist, the course was clear, they would bring upon him the vengeance of Pilate, or excite the rage of the populace. He saw their diabolic design, and turned it against themselves. He asked for the Roman coin which Tiberius had compelled them to strike, and in which alone he would accept the tribute. By making use of that money they confessed the Romans to be their masters—they therefore acknowledged their submission to that yoke whose power they could neither venture to provoke, nor were able to throw off. They acknowledged their submission to the power of Cæsar by their own act, and had bound themselves to pay its taxes by that submission. The Pharisees often excited the people to sedition by pretending zeal for the honour of God—the Herodians, by their idolatrous flattery of the delegated kings of Rome, surrendered their consciences, and broke the laws of God.

The Sadducees were not more successful in their attempts to expose our divine instructor's supposed ignorance of the law. They propounded their grand argument against the possibility of the resurrection, which they did not believe, and thought their reasoning unanswerable. Their case was that of a woman who had seven brothers as husbands successively, and supposing that, if there was to be a resurrection or future state, neither of which they believed, men could not be happy without the enjoyment of the animal pleasures of life, they thought that the practice commanded by the law of Moses was proof sufficient that such a state of existence was impossible. Christ's answer is two-fold—that the Sadducees misunderstood the scriptures, and the power of God. He could create spirit as well as matter, and render spirit happy in the enjoyment of himself for eternity, without those temporary institutions, which are necessary in this world for the maintenance of society, and the continuance of the race. And he showed them, secondly, that God, by calling himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, long after they were dead, and, according to the Sadducean belief, annihilated for ever, plainly intimated that they existed in a different state. "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Both the Pharisees and the people were astonished and delighted at this clear and conclusive refutation of the supposed irrefragable argument of their hated opponents. A Pharisean scribe, or teacher of the law, showed this by putting a question to him, with apparent sincerity, which was much disputed among them, namely, "Which was the first and greatest commandment of the law?" Some maintained that it was sacrifice; others, the observance of the Sabbath; others, circumcision; and others, the observance of other traditionary ceremonies. Christ decided the matter by referring to the law itself, the abstract of which he gives as consisting in "love to God." But he proceeded farther, and told them that the second commandment, which was like the first, springing from it, and depending upon it, was to "love our neighbour as ourselves"—that the perfection resulting from the practice of these two was the final object of all the laws of God, and of all revealed religion. Whether the learned scribe expected such an answer is not apparent; but he expressed his satisfaction and acquiescence, and received, in return, the approval of his patient and compassionate Teacher, who informed him, that a right understanding of the law was the way to the truth, and that he was "not far from the kingdom of God"—that such views prepared him for seeing the necessity and application of the doctrines of the Gospel.

These proud and venerated teachers, these learned rabbis, or captious cavillers and idle disputers, had attempted to make a pompous parade of their knowledge, and designed to expose the presumed ignorance of one whose pretensions they wished to discredit—to denounce him to the general contempt, and to bring him to destruction as a deceiver. Patiently and meekly had he borne with them—calmly, or boldly and sternly, had he answered them, and exposed their ignorance, and unmasked their fiendish malice. But knowing now that all their shafts of ingenious

* It has been supposed, from the circumstance of our Saviour's confuting the Sadducees out of the books of Moses alone, when there were many other direct declarations of a future state in the other books of the Old Testament, that they acknowledged only these books, like the Samaritans. But there is no good ground for this supposition. Josephus, who hates the sect cordially, does not allege this against them. They had brought that objection from the law of Moses, and Christ answers them out of the same part of Scripture. However, it is acknowledged by all, that the doctrine of a future retribution is not taught very fully nor clearly by the Jewish legislator; and from this fact, one of the most profound theologians of England has founded a most ingenious but paradoxical argument in proof of his divine legation.

sophistry were shot—that the quiver of their fertile invention was exhausted—he turned upon them, and, as he had the full right, began to question them as to their own knowledge of those doctrines and prophecies which they pretended to explain. He asked them the simple question, “Whose son the Messiah was?” They reply, “The son of David.” He quoted to them the expression of the inspired Psalmist—“Jehovah said unto *my Lord*, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool;” and asked them to explain the difficulty, which represented Christ as both the Son and Lord of the anointed David. They could not explain this acknowledged declaration of their own scriptures; and finding that all their malicious attempts, at every renewal, only recoiled upon themselves in severe exposure of their own ignorance and unworthy characters, they henceforth desisted from the vain and dangerous experiment—“they durst not ask him any more questions” of the kind. The superior wisdom he displayed, and the consummate ease with which he baffled and put to nought all the boasted learning of the “teachers and masters of Israel,” gave the common people a very exalted idea of his character and knowledge. For the time, they believed that all he uttered came with the sanction of high authority, and evidently began to entertain a vague hope that the Deliverer of the oppressed nation was about to commence the victorious work of their liberation.

Alas! they little knew their own character, or the true ground of those lofty visions of glory and victory which they so fondly entertained—they knew still less of the character, and undertaking, and kingdom of him who had proved himself their Messiah, by such a convincing chain of the clearest evidence. But the time was now come when he was to deliver his last discourse of warning and instruction to the assembled thousands of Israel; and, as he had commenced his public instructions by explaining and laying down the law of righteousness in its spirituality, in the length and breadth of its demands, and by showing the blessedness which was the natural and necessary consequence of perfect obedience to its precepts, he closed that public ministry by showing them the terrible guilt, the aggravated transgressions of those who pretended to teach and inculcate that law—to set the people an example of obedience to it—and by holding up the certain condemnation they had incurred—the woe which He, their Lawgiver and Saviour, was compelled, in sorrow and bitter regret, to utter against them. He began this most awful and searching of all discourses which ever laid open the guilt of men, and the justice of God, by telling his disciples and the people to listen to the teachers who sat in the chair of Mosaic authority—to obey them as far as they taught the law in its purity and simplicity, but not to imitate their example in pride, or covetousness, or licentiousness. But then the meek and lowly Jesus assumes the character of universal Judge; and, in terms of the most awful majesty and merited severity, arraigns them as guilty, and utters that sentence which He alone is entitled to pronounce and to administer. From one step to another, in the disclosure of their unworthiness and excuseless iniquity, he advances in terrible repetition and overawing denunciation of their conduct. They had not only rejected and opposed the preaching of the gospel of truth, but had used every exertion to prevent others from entering this kingdom of heaven. The widow and the fatherless they oppressed, but cloaked their cruelty by the garb of pretended devotion. Their boastful and ardent prayers would condemn them, and aggravate the sentence. They would travel over the world to make a convert to their belief, and then make him ten times more bigoted in error, and a child of perdition, than before. They perjured themselves in their most solemn

adjurations, and explained away their guilt by glozing sophistries and open profanity. They annulled the very spirit of the law by resting the important part of its obedience on ceremonial and outward trifles. They cared not for inward holiness of heart, provided they could impose upon the people, and get the character of sapientia, while they were abominable in the sight of God. They boasted of their veneration for the saints and prophets of old, but in every thing showed that they were as opposed to the doctrines of those prophets as their fathers, who rejected and slew them—they hated, and persecuted, and slew the prophets of their own day. He therefore told them plainly, that they had nearly filled up the cup of their iniquity—that they were rushing to the brink of that destruction which they had brought upon themselves—that they were ripe for “the damnation of hell.” Yet, notwithstanding all this, they would yet have time allowed to repent—Apostles and inspired teachers would be sent to testify to the truth, and to prove its doctrines. He told them that even these they would disbelieve, and reject, and murder, till the provoked patience of God, within that very generation, would exact upon the impenitent nation the delayed vengeance for all the blood which had been shed since the beginning of the world. Such terrible denunciations must have been uttered with a vehement power which silenced and overwhelmed all attempt at interruption or reply. The Judge of all the earth was in the courts of his own palace—had taken the throne of authority, and spoke with that paralyzing terror which overawed the trembling tribes under the fiery throne of judgment, which, amid the lightning and thunder of heaven, shook the Mount of God in the wilderness.

But, behold! the Saviour of infinite mercy weeps over the predestined doom of that guilty and unbelieving city, which their perverseness and wickedness compelled him, in such terms of terror, to pronounce as a warning, as well as a threat. In the agonizing anticipation of the crushing weight of the sin, and the suffering of the world, he had already sent up, from the depth of his obedient humiliation, the earnest petition, that the cup of unmingled woe should pass from him;—in the ardent strength of his love to men, and deepest sympathy in those unexampled miseries, which he foresaw, he put up the desire of his heart, that, if it were possible, God would reverse the sentence of eternal justice, and compel the people of his ancient choice to come under the tent of his mercy, besprinkled with the blood of his covenant of reconciliation. Like David, on the thrashing-floor of Araunah, he saw the sword of vengeance unsheathed in the hand of the angel of destruction, and still paused, with yearning compassion, to see if perhaps there might be some chance of repentance. Throughout the whole of his mediatory government, “judgment is emphatically his strange work,” and love and compassion appeared and predominated, even in that sentence, which, in mercy, as well as holy displeasure, he pronounced. He lingered yet a little under the gorgeous porches of that house of his Father, now devoted to destruction, and pointed out to his disciples the difference between outward show and the real spirit of devotion, in the conduct of the poor widow, who cast in her apparently contemptible contribution, and that of the great and the wealthy, who cast in to the sacred treasury their munificent sums of gold and silver. He knew the sincerity of her motive, the greatness of her sacrifice—he knew the ostentation of the popular display of the others, and awarded his approbation, for the instruction of his disciples, not according to the splendour of the offering, but the purity of the heart that brought it.

This was the last time that Christ publicly visited the temple, or appeared before the Jews to strive with their obstinate unbelief. He had given every prophetic proof,

but the concluding and crowning one, that he was indeed the "hope of Abraham,"—"the son of David,"—he had used every argument which divine wisdom could devise, and more than human eloquence urge, to persuade and convince the people of God, that he was their promised Deliverer; and now slowly and in sorrow he left that temple, in which his presence and Spirit had dwelt in glory and power for so many generations. It is difficult to judge of the motives of men, at all times, from the words of which they make use, but we cannot be very far wrong in conjecturing what were the thoughts of the followers of Jesus, when, as they retired from this "house of God, this palace of the King of holiness," they called his attention particularly to the unrivalled splendour of its structure and ornaments.* They hoped that he would soon enter that palace in the triumph of victory over those enemies whose doom he had so lately pronounced, and that the stupendous building, with all its munificent treasures, would be theirs. They had forgot that he had prophesied that this house of the glory of God would be left desolate; but he now told them that not one stone should be left upon another—those towering minarets which glowed in golden effulgence in the departing rays of the evening sun, should be levelled with the dust, though built to brave the effacing march of time, and the rage of the elements. Not satisfied with this, four of the apostles came to him, when he was seated on the Mount of Olives, looking in compassion upon that wicked and infidel city whose destruction he had pronounced and lamented. It was to be buried in the dust of ruin since he had declared it, but they still hoped it was only that he might rear a more magnificent palace for that universal kingdom of earthly power, the idea of which they could not throw aside. They were therefore anxious to know when these things should happen, when the end of the world, or of that dispensation, would take place, and what would be the sign of his coming.†

Their divine Teacher saw that they entertained false ideas and foolish hopes, and directed his answer accordingly, in one of the most terrible prophecies which a God of mercy and justice ever uttered against the guilty race of man. He told them, that before that time, many false prophets and false Christs should arise, promising deliverance, and should deceive many to their destruction. Mutinies, and insurrections, and the desolation of war, were to precede that day; signs in heaven and on earth should announce it; the earthquake, the famine, and pestilence, should

* The temple had been almost wholly rebuilt by Herod the Great, for the purpose of gaining popularity with the Jews, whom, by his cruelty, and tyranny, and idolatrous compliances with the Roman customs, he had greatly disgusted. Having obtained the permission of the priests, he levelled the summit of the hill of Sion, to a square space of nearly a furlong, raised walls from the depth of the adjoining valley, in some places to the height of 300 cubits, building them of stones, some of which were of the amazing length of forty cubits, and of corresponding breadth and thickness. The stones of the temple itself were of marble of the purest whiteness, rivalling the famed Parian or Pentelic, twenty-five cubits long, twelve high, and nine broad. The materials were prepared in two years, the temple itself was reared in a year and a half, and its various courts in eight years more. But the decorations of the buildings, and the majestic porticoes, were long in finishing, something new being added year after year, so that the Jews were expressing only the real state of matters when they said, "Forty and six years has this temple been building," for that is the meaning of the Greek tense made use of.

† We need not inform any scholar that the words translated "the end of the world" mean the termination of a definite period of time. It is clear, from the circumstances in which the Apostles put the question, that they had no very certain idea of the purport of the phrase. The Jews had persuaded themselves into the belief that their polity would continue while the world lasted; the Apostles had been informed that it would soon be overthrown, and, knowing that the Messiah was to establish a kingdom, which they expected to be temporal, they must necessarily have had a confused conception of what they had heard, mixed up with the idea of universal destruction, and a restoration which they were taught to believe was spiritual, yet which they could not separate from their preconceived expectations of temporal glory.

precede the coming of the Lord. These were all only the beginning of troubles; persecutions of the most terrible kind should cause many of his followers to apostatise; the nearest relations should betray each other; his disciples should be brought before judges, and governors, and kings; they should be beat, and persecuted, and slain. Yet, notwithstanding all this discouragement, and grievous suffering, they should not be afraid; that they were under the protection of God, and not a hair of their heads should perish, but that they should proclaim the doctrines of his kingdom in all the world. So much in general; but he told them that that glorious and impregnable city and temple should be surrounded by the desolating abomination of the Roman armies which they dreaded, and sufferings, such as the world had never witnessed, and would never again behold, would be endured by those who continued in the city, and trusted to its strength. When they saw those signs, he forewarned them to flee to the mountains, to put their sole trust in God, and pray to Him, who, for their sake, and that of his chosen flock, would shorten the days of this unequalled tribulation. The destruction of the city itself is described in the most awful language that the imagination of man can conceive. It is as if the dissolution of universal nature were portrayed—the sun should be darkened—the moon give no light—the stars fall from heaven—the solid pillars of the firmament be shaken—the trembling of the earth, and the roaring of the sea, would spread perplexity and dismay among the nations. From this fearful picture of vengeance, he diverges to the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven to the general judgment, preceded by the angels sounding the trumpet of God, to call all nations before him. All this prophecy of ruinous destruction he mingled together, and told them that that generation should see it, though it would come upon them unexpectedly, as the flood came upon the world in the days of Noah. But they were forewarned, and would escape, if they watched attentively for the signs which he had given them.*

To inculcate this duty of ceaseless vigilance, and to encourage them in it, he delivered a number of very striking and appropriate parables, the objects and truths

* It must have been a strong confirmation to the faith of the disciples, in the early ages of Christianity, when they witnessed the whole of this sublime prophecy of the provoked vengeance, and exhausted patience of God, fulfilled in its most literal sense, and most particular circumstances. In the history of Josephus, who gives a very eloquent and heart-rending account of the havoc of that desolating war, in which the strength and pride of the Jews were humbled for ever in the dust, we have still remaining the exact counterpart of the prediction in the page of authentic narrative. Ever since, the Jews, according to the prophecies from the days of Moses downwards, have been driven from the loved home of their fathers—the despised, the hated, the persecuted of all nations—still, however, remaining a distinct and strongly-marked tribe over all the earth; and in their obstinate infidelity, which was also foretold, standing out as a wonderful and living monument of the truth of God. Zion was literally ploughed like a field by the ploughshare of Roman desolation—the temple was laid prostrate, in spite of the most earnest efforts of the general, Titus, to save it; and even till now it has been trodden under the feet of the Gentiles, and shall be, till their time is fulfilled. Julian, the apostate Emperor, knew of this prophecy, and endeavoured to defeat it, by rebuilding the temple, and inviting the Jews from all nations to return to the home of their devoted love. He was baulked in his impious purpose by a stronger power than that of the empire of the world. Heaven and earth should pass away, but not one word of that prophecy was to be left unfulfilled. That predicted time of the Gentiles must be hastening to a close, and whether it be the fulness of their conversion to Christianity, or the fulness of the cup of their guilt—which we are sometimes inclined to believe, judging from the signs of our own times—we are assured, by that same infallible authority, that the prostrate banner of Judah shall again be raised—that the scattered and humbled tribes shall again lift up their heads—and that their conversion to their Messiah, whom they shall no longer doubt, will be as “life from the dead.” These are glorious prospects for them, and, through them, for the world; but our space forbids us to speculate farther.

of which are of a much more general application, than to the events which were thus predicted, and soon to take place. In that of the ten virgins, he shows the difference between those who sat at ease in Zion—who lived in careless confidence in the possession and imaginary enjoyment of the outward privileges of his Gospel, and those who kept them in active and habitual exercise, at all times looking toward the object of their hope, and ready to enter upon it. In the parable of the talents, which he delivered a second time, in a somewhat different form, he inculcates the duty, as well as necessity, laid upon every one, of cultivating and improving the various advantages which God has bestowed, and shows the folly and miserable fate of them who neglect this, upon any pretence or excuse. He shows that it will be no justification to plead that we have done his cause no harm—that we have injured no one. All our advantages and privileges are bestowed upon us for the purpose of being devoted to the cause of God—of advancing his glory and kingdom in the world. Finally, he sets forth, in very minute and striking particularity, the mode of his proceeding, and the rule which he will follow, when he comes to the last and great judgment of the world. The Son of man shall descend from heaven in his glory, with the angelic host of the holy ones of heaven around him—he shall sit down on the great white throne of universal judgment, and all nations shall be gathered before him—the good shall be separated from the bad, and he shall award them their eternal sentence, according to the deeds they have done in this life. It is remarkable, that it is works of charity and mercy alone that are mentioned as the proof of the righteous being his faithful servants and followers, and the neglect of these as the cause of the rejection and punishment of the wicked. Not as if love to God, and desire to advance his glory—not as if faith in Christ, and zeal in establishing his kingdom, and all the duties of spiritual holiness, were not necessary and indispensable proofs of that character, which alone shall procure the approval and blessing of the Judge—for he himself told the scribes, that love to God was the first and great commandment;—but, as in a court of assizes in this world, acts, and not principles and professions, are founded upon—so, in the grand final judgment, the test and proof by which the principles of every one will be justified before the assembled universe will be the active effects and fruits which these produce. The Apostle James asks, “If we love not our brother whom we have seen, how can we love God whom we have not seen?” Christ, by then proving that the wicked have neglected the lesser but ever present duty of doing good to our brethren, will show that there could be no love to God—no keeping of the commandments of Him whom we have not seen.

While our Saviour was thus looking down in deep compassion on that wicked city, self-devoted to final ruin, and pronouncing its doom, and warning his own followers how to avoid that destruction, his all-seeing eye observed his hypocritical and implacable enemies gathered in council plotting his destruction. He knew their guile and cruelty, and that their deeds of darkness loved the cover of the night. Though he had friends in the city who would have gladly received him under their roof, he had, ever since he came near its guilty walls, always left them before the cloud of darkness descended, and spent its silent watches either in the Mount of Olives, or in the village of Bethany. But he had now fulfilled his public mission of instruction and warning, and the Passover, at which he was to be offered up as the Lamb slain in symbol from the beginning of time, was within two days. He went, therefore, for the last time, to that friendly village, taking his abode in the house of Simon, whom he had cleansed of leprosy. It was here while he sat at

meat that another grateful penitent poured a box of ointment upon his head.* This excited the displeasure of a number of the disciples, as well as of Judas, who all thought that it was an unnecessary piece of extravagance to be repeated within the same week. "It might," they said, "have been sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor." Christ not only justified, but highly commended, the deep spirit of piety which had prompted this sacred anointing before his burial, and gently censured the pretended care of the covetous disciples for the poor, whom they had at all times with them, while they knew He was soon to be taken from them.

Whatever were the motives of the other disciples, and with whatever meekness or compunction they bore that censure of their thoughts, and that high commendation of the object of their displeasure, it is certain that incurable avarice was the ruling vice of Judas, the traitor and thief. He thought or felt himself peculiarly aimed at in that reproof. The evil spirit took thorough possession of his covetous and disappointed heart. He arose in the impetuosity of that blind passion, deserted his Master, went to the city, where, it seems, he found the equally enraged council still deliberating in the palace of the high priest, and bargained with them for thirty shekels to deliver his Master into their hands. Such an offer they eagerly grasped at, and entered into his terms.†

* Many consider this as the same testimony of female affection which was shown to Jesus when he came first to Bethany, on this present occasion, but it is obviously different in all its circumstances. The first was in the house of Lazarus, and was poured on his feet; this in that of Simon, and poured on his head. In the first case only Judas censured, in the latter many of the disciples. Judas could not have betrayed him immediately after the first, but after the latter he went and offered his services to the priests, who were consulting.

† All the Evangelists agree in stating that disappointed avarice was the ruling motive which inspired Judas with this most diabolical resolution which ever entered into the mind of sinful man. But such treachery on the part of one who must have known the character of Christ so fully gives rise to deeper inquiry. It is evident that he would not be a witness against his divine Master—the priests did not even offer to bring him forward, which they most certainly would have done, had they been able to use his evidence in proof of any imposture. They would have been their first and safest; but though it is not mentioned, we may conclude that he refused such an impossible condition. These considerations lead us to the conclusion that deeper and more powerful, though still collateral motives, entered into the mind of the traitor, through this leading avenue. His attachment to that Master, whom he could not but believe to be the Christ, seems to have arisen from the eager hope of worldly riches and worldly power which he expected under his government as a temporal prince. He, as well as the rest, had been long anxiously expecting the establishment of that kingdom of their hope, as we have all along seen; but he evidently was more disappointed than all the rest at the delay, although he could have no doubt that Christ had the power and means to establish it when he chose, and we have no doubt that he was one of the most enthusiastic that shouted the hosannah song of "God save the Son of David," as the triumphal procession advanced a few days before into the city. We may well imagine that in the folly and madness of his disappointed hopes he resolved to bring the matter to a decisive crisis. He had no doubt, we shall suppose, that, if Jesus were brought into the presence of the high council, he had full power to defend himself, to assert his authority, to gain over those who were now his enemies, and establish his kingdom at once, in the manner which the worldly disciple had fixed with himself was the only predicted Messiahship. We think that such a supposition is sufficient to account for all his conduct, and there is nothing in the narrative of the Evangelists inconsistent with it, but rather the contrary. Jesus repeatedly told them that one of the party should betray him; but he always predicted that he would *rise* again, and establish his kingdom. He pointed out Judas, at last, as that individual, but obscurely, and told him to do quickly what he had resolved to do. This the now totally self-deceived traitor, under the suggestion of the devil, might take as no determined disapproval of his plan, or of the means which he had devised to bring it about. The miserable agony of disappointment which led him to the desperate act of self-destruction, after he saw his scheme totally fail, and after he had confessed his guilt in *betraying* (as he now saw) innocent blood, is a presumption to the same effect. This supposition does not at all palliate his guilt in betraying his Master, but it seems to account for conduct, which to us appears otherwise unac-

The priests, then, who had declared in the solemn assembly of their nation, that it was *necessary that one should die for the people*, were ready for the sacrifice—the Lamb also for that greatest sacrifice, which the spiritual intelligences contemplate as the most wonderful mystery set before them in all the doings of God, was also ready. The day was come—that day which He, the great Saviour and Redeemer of men, had so eagerly longed to see—for the great consummating work, of which he had come into the world, had dawned upon the mountains of Judea, and upon the gilded palaces of the daughter of Zion. We enter not into the rather profitless dispute which was so long, and eagerly, and learnedly carried on, whether Jesus observed this Passover on the day of the national festival, or on that before it—whether the Jews deviated from the day ordained by Moses, and our Lord observed it—we assume with Macknight, to whose Dissertation we refer, that Christ did observe the feast one day before the rest of the nation.

He seems to have spent the greater part of the day among his affectionate friends of Bethany, but sent two of his disciples into the city, for the purpose of making all things ready, giving them such directions as to the house in which these preparations should be made, as none but one of omniscient foresight could give. He told them that, on entering the city, they should meet a man bearing a pitcher of water—that they should follow him, and would find an apartment prepared for the ceremony.

All this was done—the lamb was slain, and the evening was come. He came with the twelve and sat down to that Supper, which was the only antitype that gave meaning, in a spiritual sense, to the commemorative rite which reminded the Israelites of their deliverance from the iron oppression of Egypt. He expressed the ardent desire which he had felt to celebrate this last proof of his love to them on earth—drank the preparatory cup, and gave it to the whole of his disciples—condescended to the lowest office of menial service, by washing their feet, thus impressing upon them, by striking example, the spirit of humility which all his doctrines inculcated. Peter, at first, with his usual openness and boldness of spirit, refused such an office at the hands of his revered and beloved Master; but, when he understood its spiritual import, went to the other extreme, and, like those who have set him, through his pretended successors, in the place of God, would have wished to add much more to the simplicity of that rite which was so full of meaning in itself. That was a Supper of deep import, declaring the abolition of all the ancient ceremonial institutions, which, through material rites, had, for such a length of generations, pointed the faith of the believing children of the promise upward, through means of the outward observance, to the spiritual signification, and the institution of another and a simpler commemorative rite, which united the past with the present and the future; which identified the spiritual with the material, and held forth a God of infinite justice and holiness to creatures, who needed the exercise of infinite mercy, and infinite forgiveness. While celebrating this last joyous festival in memory of the deliverance of the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage, and about to institute one to commemorate a still more wonderful redemption, the sorrow of deepest dejection came over his spirit. He told his disciples that one of their number should betray him. This announcement, in such circumstances, raised the greatest anxiety and grief.

countable. Macknight adopts this theory; and we believe also the suspectedly heterodox Archbishop of Dublin has been uttering it lately in public, and subjected himself to no little ignorant obloquy on that

All those attached followers reclining round that table knew that he was intimately acquainted with the thoughts and characters of every one of them, and were sure that he spoke no word in vain. But who, in that chosen company, who had been all so highly honoured with his friendship—who had all followed him through every scene of sorrow, and poverty, and persecution, could now prove a traitor, when the consummation of his mighty work was at hand, when the glory which he was to bestow upon all was so certain and so near? Sympathetic dismay spreads round the table—all ask if it could possibly be they who could show such treachery—Peter beckons to the beloved disciple, who reclined on the bosom of his Master, to ascertain—the sign is given to him. Judas receives the sop from the hand of his indulgent Master; and, notwithstanding the consciousness of the guilty paction which he had the night before made with the priests and rulers, has the audacity to ask if he was the denounced traitor. Christ gives plain intimation that it was he himself, and tells him to do quickly what he had determined to accomplish. After this, his detected guilt could endure no longer—he retired to execute that crime to which he was now doubly pledged by his own perverted heart, and the suggestion of the devil. There are some difficulties connected with the question, whether Judas went out to perpetrate his fearful crime before the institution of the Christian festival of love, or after he had participated in it along with the rest, and arose from that deep pledge of loyalty and affection upon his soul to go and execute his premeditated treachery. There is no doctrine of any practical importance to be derived, whether we suppose the one or the other, as to the unquestioned holiness of character necessary in all those who partake of that sealing pledge of devotion—seeing that Judas, most certainly then, and always before, participated along with the rest, of the analogous binding pledge of the old covenant. But, comparing the accounts of the different Evangelists, it seems most probable that he went out before the institution of the Christian rite.

After the traitor had departed, Jesus proceeded to institute that sacred ordinance commemorative of a deliverance far more glorious than that from the galling bondage of the oppression of Egypt—of which that was only the earthly type, the figurative intimation. In the injunction of the laws of the covenant of Sinai, God frequently prefaced and sanctioned them by the reason, “I am the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,” and the sacrifice of the Passover was instituted to bring to the remembrance of all generations the terrible consummating act of judgment which set the prisoners free. That preparatory dispensation was on the point of being abolished for ever, and Christ instituted an ordinance to commemorate, till the end of time, a more wonderful act of judgment, in which the whole character of the Holy Ruler of the world—his infinite justice and mercy, his faithfulness and truth, were made manifest to all. In the days of his lowliness, and striving with the perversity of men, he had longed with strong desire for the arrival of this hour, and now when his bitterest foes were gathered together against him, and all the instruments of their cruelty were ready, when the clouds of the blackness of darkness were thickening in awful gloom over his head, when the cup of the divine vengeance for the aggravated sins of the whole world was presented to his lips, and he was ready to drain its unspeakable agony to the dregs, in that hour of crushing woe he filled a cup of infinite compassion and affection for the consolation and joy of his devoted followers. That bread which he broke and gave to all, that blood of the vine which he poured out, were henceforth to be symbolical of the sacred mystery of his life laid down, of his blood shed, for the life of all who received the rite in faith. This, as Christ told them, was an exhibition

of that act of holy justice by which God would be glorified, by which he was immediately, as the Son of man, to be glorified in God, and to assert the glory of his government.

It is strange, but deeply edifying, to reflect now obtrusively and importunately human passions and ambitious thoughts will mix with our most affecting and solemn services of spiritual devotion. Christ had told them that he would no more taste with them of this fruit of the vine till he drank it new with them in his "Father's kingdom"—he had told them that he was "straightway to be glorified"—and the announcement, even in that solemn hour, when they knew that the traitor had gone on his mission of death, their ambitious rivalry about priority in the posts of honour in that "kingdom of glory," again created a jealous contention among the feeble and devoted victims of a resistless and now triumphant persecution. He once more taught them that the spirit of humility was that worthy of most honour in his kingdom; but notwithstanding he saw and pitied their mistaken ambition, again assured them that they should recline at the royal table of his kingdom, and "sit on twelve thrones, judging the tribes of Israel."

This was the symbolic mystery of the joyful union of Christ and his disciples; but he told them then of his speedy departure, of their own scattering abroad like a flock without a shepherd, of the joy of their enemies over their imagined victory, of the threatened rage of their more terrible enemy, the tempter and destroyer of the souls of men. Peter, the bold Galilean, who had furnished himself with a sword, as well for the work of his fondly anticipated victory, as for defence against those enemies of whose machinations Christ had given such clear intimation, observing what he considered the despondency of his Master, offered to accompany him even to prison, and to death, if that were necessary. He was informed, in reply to this self-confident boasting of devoted attachment, that he should thrice deny Christ that very night; not only so, but that, in the sifting temptation to which Satan would subject him, his faith would altogether fail, were it not for the prevailing efficacy of the prayer of the Son of man in his behalf. In continuance, he taught his followers many high mysteries, gave them many promises of the instruction and direction of the Spirit of all truth, and bound them to mutual love in the midst of all the sorrows and persecutions which awaited them. But though it was to be accomplished, as it had been foretold, that they should all be offended in him, and should all forsake him, yet he comforted them in pity, at the prospect of that weakness, told them that he went before to prepare a place of rest, that he would see them again in Galilee after his resurrection, and that he would return, and take them to be for ever with himself. Having sung part, or the whole, of the paschal hymn, beginning with the 114th, and ending with the 118th Psalm, he left the house, and went with them over the brook Kedron, into the solitude of the Mount of Olives.

It was here, before the agony of that mysterious spiritual contest commenced, that he addressed them again in words of deeper affection, and more tender compassion, than ever dwelt in the human heart, or flowed from human tongue.* He had already often told them of his own union with the Father—of his being Lord and Judge of all; he now informs them of their union with him, of its spiritual nature, and

* The passage is contained in the 15th and 16th chapters of John, and, besides the consolation which it must breathe into the heart of every true Christian, from the deep love which, in such terrific circumstances, Christ testified for his followers, is replete with many of the most essential doctrines of the gospel, expressed in the plainest and most striking figurative language.

of the principle of life thence derived. Using the figure of the vine, many of which grew around them, he extends the analogy throughout the whole Christian life, from the source whence flows all its vital energy, tracing it through all the duties of mutual love, and unity of spirit, and the ripe and abundant fruits of active duty. Though he should be taken from them now, apparently for ever, that union of spiritual life and heavenly love was not broken, as it would seem to a cold, and selfish, and hateful world—it only commenced in its perfect form—it was only to be confirmed by the gift of the Holy Spirit, who, when he departed, would descend and dwell in their hearts, as in the living and spiritual temple of the Father of spirits. They were no longer his servants, who could obtain nothing by themselves, without his first petitioning the Father for them—they should now ask for themselves in his name, and all their requests would be granted. He knew that they looked for glory and power in the world—he assured them that they should have tribulation, and disappointment in all such carnal expectations, yet that in all they should rejoice; for whatever to them might seem, and whatever the men of this world might think, he was about to consummate that final victory, which, from the beginning of time, had been announced as the great deliverance and hope of man.

Having uttered the last continuous discourse which he ever delivered in the days of his suffering humanity, for the instruction and comfort of his disciples, standing, as it were, between heaven and earth, between the relations of time and those of eternity, still holding sympathetic communion of present sorrow with those who had companied with him during the years of his homeless labours, but looking to the invisible bosom of that infinite love in which he had dwelt from eternity, he sent up to the throne of heaven the most deeply affecting intercessory prayer which had ever ascended from earth to heaven. The days of that patient and friendly converse were no more; his humble but faithful followers were to be left alone in a hostile world, like sheep among wolves; but he had now accomplished the great work of afflicted and persecuted obedience—he was about to finish the work of suffering victory, and the gift of life eternal was now in his hands, and at his disposal. Like Elijah, who ascended to heaven in the fiery chariot of the Eternal King of Israel, he prayed that the mantle of his power and glory should fall upon his friends and followers, who were now commissioned, with higher authority, to execute the purposes of his mission, and fight his battles with a faithless race—with a persecuting world. He knew the weakness of their faith—he knew the mistaken ambition of their fond hopes—but he knew also how these mistaken expectations were to be directed aright, and how his “own joy would be fulfilled in them,” when they should fight with a firmer faith, and a more certain knowledge, the spiritual battles of the cross. With all that certain knowledge of the councils of eternity—of all that he had taught, of all he knew of what they believed, he committed them, in the confiding love of his human nature, to the protecting power of his Almighty Father; he sent them, under the overshadowing shield and directing Spirit of his own divinity, to prosecute the perfection of that victory which he had gained—to erect in the world that kingdom which he had descended from heaven to establish on earth, as the only means of manifesting the holiness of the Eternal Father, not only to the inhabitants of this earth, but to the spiritual thrones and dominions of all his intellectual and moral universe.

This was the natural and divine exultation of one who held heaven and earth in his hands—the divine and the human nature united in one, who already had his brow

crowned with the amaranthine wreath of victory and salvation. But the severest struggle of that victory was yet before him, and the weakness and natural feelings of humanity were within him, and the lowering clouds of inexpressible woe, charged with all the guilt of a rebellious world, were descending upon his soul. He expressed himself as "exceeding sorrowful, even unto death,"—took with him the three favoured disciples, and retired into the garden of Gethsemane, to wrestle alone in the unexplained and incomprehensible agony of suffering and oppressed humanity, under that weight of the sin of a condemned world, which he had taken upon him. Into the mysterious depths of those unknown spiritual sufferings we cannot enter—the cause of persevering and repeated entreaty that the bitter cup of unmingled misery should, if it were *possible*, pass away from him—we may not venture to explain. Nothing is impossible with the Omnipotent, but this was willed and decreed in the councils of eternity; and, though in that agonizing struggle of unexampled suffering and importunate prayer, the feeble frame of flesh and blood gave way, "the agony of the soul was the soul of that mysterious anguish," and those great drops of sweat that rained down in the garden of that "wine-press of the wrath of God," were not expressed by the common sympathy of the soul with the approaching torments of the body, but sprung from that deeper source of the fountain of all misery which was filled to overflowing with the sins of a rebellious and revolted race. "What could it be, O Saviour! that lay thus heavy on thy divine soul?" says the excellent Bishop Hall. "Was it the fear of death? Was it the forefelt pain, shame, torment, of thine ensuing crucifixion? O poor, and base thoughts of the narrow hearts of cowardly and impotent mortality! How many thousands of thy blessed martyrs have welcomed no less tortures with their smiles and gratulations, and have made a sport of those exquisite cruelties which their very tyrants thought insufferable? Whence had they this strength but from thee? If their weakness were thus undaunted and prevalent, what was thy power? No, no; it was the sad weight of the sin of mankind—it was the heavy burden of thy Father's wrath for our sin, that thus pressed thy soul, and wrung from thee those bitter expressions."

In the first contest with the great enemy of God and of man in the wilderness, he had entered into the trial alone, in the single strength of his human nature, with the ever-present aid of that Spirit of all holiness which dwelt in him so fully—this spiritual struggle is a darker and more terrible trial, when his soul was agonized under the overwhelming weight of the guilt of a whole world. It is altogether impossible that we can yet imagine the real horrors of that gloom of the blackness of spiritual darkness. It was not the fear of death, nor the terror of his foes of flesh and blood, all whose hate and machinations he had foreseen,—it was not the more reckless onset of the prince of darkness, whose legions were gathered round him, in the imagined triumph of vainly anticipated victory,—it was not the worldly hopes, or faint-hearted fear of his pledged and devoted followers. All these he had long foreseen, and well known. It was the avenging displeasure of God against sin, which he had willingly encountered,—the sword of the Almighty was now unsheathed, and, according to the prophecy, had "awaked in its terror against the fellow and equal of God;" but though Omnipotence and infinite holiness were engaged to fight the battle of sinful human nature against the offended Majesty of the Lawgiver of heaven, it was in all the attributes of that nature which he had assumed. "The sword of divine justice pierced through his soul,"—the avenging arrows of the Almighty, who was then maintaining, in presence of the universe, the unchangeable rectitude of his just law, were shot against him. He trod that

wine-press of wrath "alone"—of the people whom he came to save, whom he had chosen, there was none to help him. While he prayed and wrestled fervently in that garden of woe, so different from the garden of Eden, where the first contest was fought and lost, his disciples, who had been warned to watch and pray in that hour of danger, had repeatedly fallen asleep. The ravening wolves had already hemmed in the helpless fold, and the "stout Galilean," with all his martial boldness, along with his as ardent compeers, had repeatedly forgot their Master's charge, and were dreaming of the security of their humble homes, or perchance of the glories of that kingdom of victorious conquest to which they looked forward. But though of "his own people there was none to aid," and none to be with him, the watchers of heaven, the holy ones of the spiritual world, were not uninterested. For the time they had laid aside their harps of celestial song, and had left the bowers of the paradise above, and were there, visible through the darkness of the night, to comfort and encourage Him who had pitied and helped, when none among all their principedoms or dominions could devise the means of aid or deliverance. "As when two seas meet," says Jeremy Taylor, with quaint *poetic* truth, "the billows contest in ungente embraces, and make violent noises, till, having wearied themselves into smaller waves and disunited drops, they run quietly into one stream—so did the spirit and nature of Jesus assault each other with disagreeing interests, and distinguishing disputations, till the earnestness of the contention was diminished by the demonstrations of the Spirit and the prevailings of grace, which the sooner got the victory, because they were not to contend with an unsanctified or a rebellious nature, but a body of affections, which had no strong desires, but of its own preservation; and therefore Jesus went thrice, and prayed the same prayer, that, if it were possible, the cup might pass from him, and thrice made an act of resignation; and in the intervals came and found his Apostles asleep, gently chiding their incuriousness, and warning them to watch and pray, that they enter not into temptation; till the time that the traitor came with a multitude, armed with swords and staves, from the priests and elders of the people to apprehend him."

That avaricious traitor, who had basely coveted the three hundred pieces of silver, when expended in bestowing a high honour of affection upon his Master's sacred head, had, in his mad ambition, sold that head for thirty, and now that "son of perdition was at hand," with the treacherous smile on his face, leading his armed band of ready murderers to that well-known spot, which he had often pretended to hallow with his prayers—where he had often listened to the voice of wisdom and salvation from the lips of his compassionate and all-knowing Teacher. From the mysterious agony of the spiritual contest, he now went to meet with prepared willingness his foes of flesh and blood. Judas ran before the soldiers with seeming anxiety, as if to warn Jesus of the approach of danger, and hailed him with an insidious kiss. From the term used by the Evangelist, it would appear that the band consisted of a thousand Roman soldiers with their tribune, accompanied by a number of the armed officers and servants of the priests. Overwhelming as this force was against the object of their violence, He showed them how easily he could have enervated the might of all their warlike array. When they came near to seize him, the overpowering divinity that dwelt within him paralyzed their strength—like waves against a rock, they recoiled back, and twice fell upon their faces. After such proof of his power we might have thought that they would have returned in terror to those who sent them; but the hour was now come, in which it was ordained that the "power of darkness" should be allowed to defeat his own evil purposes

by executing his satanic machinations; Jesus, therefore, asked them whom they were seeking, and surrendered himself into their hands. While they were binding their victim, and probably, according to the Roman manner, covering his head, Peter was roused to desperate revenge, drew his sword to attack the whole cohort, and smote off the ear of one of the high priest's servants. He was restrained and reproved by Christ, who told him, that if he had chosen to escape that plot, or defeat these his enemies, instead of a thousand warriors of flesh and blood, he could have called to his aid twelve legions of angels; but by such a host to fight his battles and gain his victories, the prophecies of all the scriptures would be defeated. According to these prophecies also, the disciples, seeing their Master bound, and willing to make no resistance, and forbidding any to be made, forsook him and fled.

He was now alone in the hands of his enemies, "led like a lamb to the slaughter." He was brought, in the midst of insult and cruelty, to the palace of the high priest Caiaphas, where were assembled all the chief priests, and rulers, and men of learning. Peter, recovering some of his resolution, and another disciple, supposed to have been John, followed at a distance, and gained admission to witness the result of that trial in which their hopes and affections were so deeply interested. As it proceeded, Peter was thrice challenged with being a follower of the Nazarene, and thrice denied the truth of the accusation, in which he once gloried, and each time with stronger asseverations of the falsehood of the charge. The third time, it was with loud oaths, and imprecations upon himself, in testimony of his truth. While the oath was upon his lips, the cock crew, and his Master turned an eye of compassionate reproach upon his cowardly, and nearly apostate follower. That silent reproof of offended love, and that warning voice which brought to his mind the prediction uttered a few short hours before, which, in his confident security, he would not believe, now filled him with the most heart-rending remorse—he became conscious of his faithless conduct, went out, and wept bitterly. These were gracious tears of unfeigned sorrow, and the timely aid which was brought rescued him from an apostacy, which threatened to be almost as guilty, from his ardent temper, as the colder avarice of the arch-traitor had been.*

We have related, consecutively, the whole scene of this faint-hearted denial of his Master, on the part of one of the first called, the most highly honoured, and the foremost and boldest of his followers; but, during its progress, the mockery of a trial had been also going on. The undoubted Son of David, the lawful heir of his throne and power, the predicted Messiah—who, by innumerable proofs and "signs," had given convincing evidence that He was the long and eagerly expected One, who was to bring consolation and deliverance to the chosen people—was placed before the great, the wise, and the learned of the nation, so long favoured and loved of God. Day and night did they pretend to study the Scriptures, and to expound their doctrines and prophecies to their flock, and now the crisis of their fate was come. He who had it in his power to restore the fallen honour of Judah, to raise the sceptre of universal rule over all heathen nations, was brought to the bar of men

* From the circumstance of the warning voice of the watcher of the night awakening the feeling of repentant remorse in the bosom of the half-renegade Apostle, it is said that the custom took its origin of placing the figure of this bird upon the towers and steeples of sacred edifices. We would be inclined to believe a tradition which assigns a reason so full of pathetic instruction to a nearly universal practice. The Rabbinical cavil against the fact of the warning is absurd, namely, that no bird of its kind was allowed to be kept within the walls of the holy city. There is not the slightest foundation for such an assertion.

who ought to have been prepared to decide upon the agreement of the claims with which he appeared, with the prophecies of all their scriptures, and with the most exalted of all their hopes. But what was their conduct, what were their motives, and the result? They indeed asked him what were his doctrines, what was his authority, what was his object? His doctrines they had often heard; of his authority they ought to have been able to judge, else they were no fit rulers and teachers of Israel—else they understood not the text which God had given them for deciding the claims and character of a prophet;—and if they understood, and could judge of these, they must have been able to conclude what was his object. But the whole process was the mockery of justice and of truth. They knew not the latter, and had resolved to outrage the former. They had brought him before them, not with the design of ascertaining whether he was, in truth, the Angel of the covenant, their promised Prince and Deliverer, but to condemn him, as one who was their bitterest and worst enemy. In mockery, they called witnesses, but it was only those who, they knew, would testify against him. They railed in haughty pride—they accused with the confidence of men who knew that there were none to resist; but all their accusations and charges were only either in regard to frivolous things, or were self-contradictions. They brought the charge of his having declared, that he would rebuild the temple in three days, if they would destroy it; but their suborned witnesses could not agree, and they had not ventured to apply the test when it was proposed, even had it been in the sense which they wished to allege. But the proud Caiaphas had already expressed his consistorial sentence, that it was expedient that one should die for the people, and he was resolved to obtain a condemnation. “I adjure thee, by the living God, to tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God!” Solemn and awful adjuration! to which no son of man durst venture to remain silent. But, behold the crafty and malicious design! They knew that he had assumed that character, and appealed to all his works and doctrines, in proof of his right to exercise it. But for this very assumption they had resolved to condemn him, as guilty of blasphemy; if he confessed that he did not assume the title, and had no claim to it, they would condemn him as an impostor, who deceived the people. Being thus awfully adjured, in the name of the God of truth, by the highest religious authority of the land, Jesus no longer kept silence—he confessed that he was the Son of the most High God, and added, that they should hereafter see him on the right hand of Power, and coming to judgment in the clouds of heaven. In such circumstances, this ought to have brought the whole council to a pause of solemn deliberation. But it was what the murderous judges eagerly longed for—Caiaphas rent his garments, and the priests and rulers of Israel, as Jesus had often foretold, resolved unanimously to put to death Him who had acknowledged, and so often proved, himself to be the Son of their Eternal King.

They could condemn him as guilty, they could mock him in the heartless cruelty of bitter derision—buffet, and spit upon him, and insultingly ask him then to prove his prophetic or divine power, but they had no power to put their sentence in execution. Early as it was, while the vernal sun had scarcely risen upon that high day of solemn convocation. in the ardour of their triumphant zeal, they hurry their patient victim to the palace of the representative of Roman tyranny. That crafty deputy knew something of the character of the people over whom he had acted so long as provincial procurator—he knew that the priests had brought him thither from envy. These sanctified accusers, whose errand was to get the sentence of

death passed on one whom their own consciences knew to be innocent—whose hands were already stained deep with the blood of Him whom they ought to have hailed with the hosannahs of rapture as their anointed King, scruple at the imaginary ceremonial defilement which they would incur by entering on the pavement of the heathen ruler. Their clamour brings the crafty governor to them, he hears their accusation, repeatedly declines intermeddling; they tell him that the accused was a Galilean—as they meant, one of that sect which had resisted payment of tribute to the Romans. The Roman tried to escape the guilt of sentencing one whose innocence he knew, by sending him to Herod of Galilee, who, though on no friendly terms with him, ought to have the jurisdiction of all the inhabitants of that country. Thither he was soon dragged, and the infidel king expected his curiosity to be gratified by the sight, or by the miracles, of one whose fame had so often reached his ears, and disturbed his guilty conscience. He might have had many opportunities before of judging for himself of the claims of Christ, and of the authority by which they were substantiated; now that time was past, the active ministry of the Messiah was over, and he spoke not to gratify the idle curiosity of the sensual king—he replied not to all the clamorous and violent accusations of the priests—he uttered not a word in confutation of their alleged treasonable and blasphemous charge against him for assuming the title of Messiah. Now the prophetic psalm was fulfilled, “Kings of the earth had set themselves—princes had combined against the Lord and his anointed.” They knew not that in their triumphant mockery they were only instruments in the hands of the Almighty for the accomplishment of his own mysterious and eternal decree. Herod, and his men of war, set Him, by whom kings reign, at nought—they clothed him, in derision, in a royal robe, and, in *polite* deference to the Roman authority, sent him thus back to the tribunal of Pilate; and henceforth these jealous rivals for power became friends from their unanimity in condemning the guiltless.

We need not detail at length the outrageous clamour of the priests, and rulers, and multitude, against their unresisting victim—the repeated declarations of the impartial Roman judge, that he could see no guilt in all that they alleged, that by investigation he could find no crime in Jesus worthy of death—his anxious wish to escape the guilt which he felt that he must incur in condemning one against whom no crime was proved, or even brought. He attempted frequently to soften their bigot rage, to show them the groundless nature of their suspicions and fears—offered to gratify them by using the privilege of pardoning a criminal, which had been a customary favour granted them on that occasion, giving them the alternative of Jesus, or Barabbas the robber and murderer. The hill of Zion, which, a few days before, had echoed to the joyous shouts of “Hail, King of the Jews! Hosannah to the Son of David!” now rang with savage howls of “Away with him! Crucify him!” They threatened to accuse their governor to the jealous and merciless Tiberius, for favouring a usurper of the royal title of the Casars, and compelled him at last to pass the sentence of condemnation, though warned by his wife, who had had an ominous dream, to have nothing to do with such condemnation of an innocent person. He washed his hands, declared that upon them should be the guilt of unjust judgment, released Barabbas, and gave Jesus to his soldiers to be scourged with rods. The back of the patient sufferer, and triumphant Saviour, was ploughed with the furrows of their cruelty—they clothed him in royal purple—put a crown of tearing thorns upon his head, a rod, in mockery, in that hand which was soon about to sway the sceptre of a redeemed world, smote him, spit upon him, and

bent the knee in solemn derision of his sovereignty. In this woful plight, his temples and face streaming with blood, Pilate thought that he might yet stir those hard hearts to the feeling of pity, and again repeatedly attempted to divert their rage, by presenting the patient and humble sufferer before them. They again rejected their King—declared they had no king but Cæsar, and imprecated the guilt of that blood which they were determined to shed upon their own heads, and the heads of their children. Terribly did they thus fill up the cup of their guilt—fearfully were they compelled to drain it to the lowest and bitterest dregs, and heavily has it lain upon the guilty heads of their miserable children, ever since they rose in rebellion against their merciful King and Saviour, and rejected all his offers of deliverance.*

The consummation of that mighty work of salvation was not yet come, and, with the triumphant shout of men who had gained the object of their most eager desire, they drag him away to the place of ordinary execution. Exhausted and lacerated as he was, he was compelled to bear the cross upon which he was to suffer. Deeply woful as the scene had now become, we can easily imagine the exulting triumph of those relentless persecutors who saw Jesus faint under the load of that cross of which he had often spoken to his disciples. As they marched through the streets of Jerusalem, with their willing and insulted victim so completely in their power, associated with the vilest malefactors, who were to suffer along with him, we may suppose what were the thoughts of his enemies—what was the forlorn despair of his followers. The former assured themselves that all their fears, and all their chance of being exposed, were now at an end, and the latter, while they gazed upon the woful state of Him, in whom they knew that resistless might resided, from whom they expected the demonstration of a divine authority, before which all other should quail, must have been conscious of a strange misgiving of belief in regard to the character of their Master. Faint and exhausted though he was, unable to drag along that tree of shame to which his hands were to be nailed, he saw the sorrow of those who had followed him in love and in faith. Simon of Cyrene was compelled to bear the burden of that cross under which He fainted, and the wondering multitudes crowded around, to behold the issue of an event, which, from all they had heard and seen, must have been full of strange and inexplicable mystery. The wail of female sympathy was heard above all that triumphant shout of remorseless persecution, and He who deeply felt for all human sorrow, while he consoled, also warned them of a woe, which, on the account of the doings of that day, would fall terribly upon them and their children. They could not foresee the glory that he was about to earn, but he saw the national retribution of predicted vengeance, under which all of the chosen tribes of God were soon to suffer, and warned them to look

* Pilate, who thus with open eyes outraged justice, and condemned to that death which was inflicted by the Romans only on slaves, an individual whom he knew to be completely innocent, that he might gain popularity with the Jews, and avoid the danger of being accused to the Roman Emperor, was shortly after sent to Rome by Vitellius, the president of Syria, to answer charges brought against him by these same Jews. He was condemned, and banished to Vienna in the south of Gaul, where he lived in misery, till, becoming impatient of his wretchedness and disgrace, he is reported to have killed himself with his own hands. Herod also some years after, for his ambitious designs, was deprived of his tetrarchy, and along with the incestuous Herodias was disgraced, and banished into the same country; and afterwards fled thence into Spain, where he died in poverty and deserved misery. A ten times severer retribution awaited the more implacable and guilty Jews, under which their nation was blotted from the face of the earth, and their descendants, till they repent, are doomed to bear the mark of Cain on their brow.

to that, and bewail over their own coming miseries. "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children."

The sun was now high in the heavens, when that procession, strangely composed of triumphal exultation and the wailings of bitterest woe, advanced up the hill of Calvary—the hill of skulls and scattered bones—where criminals were executed. The soldier stripped off his clothes, nailed his hands and feet to the cross, while he prayed for forgiveness to those who, in ignorance of his character, put him to so torturing and shameful a death. We need not attempt to describe the circumstances of that incomprehensible but victorious agony. It consists not in the mangling of the flesh, the rending of the sinews, the anguish of the soul, expelled slowly by the intolerable pains of the body, bleeding, drop by drop, to death. Those lingering torments were endured by the malefactors as well as by him. Andrew is reported to have hung two days on the cross before he expired, and many have remained suspended in its agonies till they died of hunger, or were devoured by beasts or birds of prey. The descriptive pen, or the skill of the painter, may pourtray "his hands and feet mangled and pierced, but who can describe how, in one hand, he grasped multitudes of souls ready to sink into ruin, and, in the other hand, an everlasting inheritance to give them? or how those bruised feet crushed the old serpent's head, and trampled death and hell, and sin, the author of both? We may describe the blood issuing from his body, but not the water of life streaming from the same source, in oceans of spiritual and eternal blessings; we may paint how that blood covered his own body, but not how it sprinkles the souls of others, yea, sprinkles many nations; we may paint the crown of thorns which he wore, but not the crown of glory which he purchased; we may paint the outward appearance of his sufferings, but not the inward bitterness, or invisible causes of them; we may paint Christ bearing the cross to Calvary, but not Christ borne down to death by the sins of a guilty world; we may describe the nails piercing his sacred flesh, but who can describe eternal justice piercing both flesh and spirit? we may describe the soldier's spear, but not the arrows of the Almighty; the cup of vinegar which he tasted, but not the cup of wrath which he drank out to the lowest dregs; the derision of the Jews, but not the desertion of the Eternal Father forsaking his Son, that he might never forsake us, who were his enemies." *

While he hung there a spectacle to heaven and earth, with the inscription above his head, "JESUS OF NAZARETH, KING OF THE JEWS;" the priests and multitudes taunted him with his miracles, and called upon him to perform one now, and they would believe upon him—"He saved others, himself he cannot save.—Let Christ, the King of Israel, descend now from the Cross, and we will believe on him." Even the malefactors on the cross beside him joined in the profane mockery; and, though about to enter the presence of the Eternal Judge along with him, scoffingly asked him to deliver them from their torments. One of these, however, probably convinced of the truth of Jesus being the Messiah by the signs which were hung out in heaven, and displayed on earth, before the scene of suffering was at its close, besought him to have mercy, and remember him when he entered his kingdom; and, even in that last hour of living hope, received the assurance that he should that very night be with him in paradise. While thus suffering the railing insults of those unjust rulers, and of that heartless multitude, for whose sake he was submitting to

* We are indebted for the above extract to an excellent and eloquent Sermon by Mr MacLaurin of Glasgow, on "Glorying in the Cross of Christ."

death, his compassion towards his own followers and friends was not expelled by that depressing agony of unspeakable woe. He saw the weeping virgin mother, whose soul, according to the prediction of old Simeon, was now pierced by the sword of bitter anguish and disappointed hope, who was so soon, as far as this world was concerned, to become a childless widow, standing beside the Apostle whom he loved. He devolved the care of providing for the bereaved widow upon John, whom he requested to treat as a mother, and her to look upon him as a son.

Few eyes were there to shed tears of sorrow over the expiring tortures of the Son of God—few faces in that exulting and mislead multitude were overclouded with sympathizing grief. But the bright face of the sun was eclipsed in darkness—his fountain of bright effluence was dried up, and ceased to shed his life-giving rays, while the pale shade of death came over the countenance of the Sun of righteousness—while that Mighty One was suffering who had called the universe into existence—who had said, “Let there be light, and there was light.” This was no natural eclipse of the material source of light, by the interposition of the moon, for the Pass-over was observed not at the new, but the full moon—it was not for a few minutes—it continued three hours—it was not local, over the spiritually benighted and deluded people alone, but seems to have shed its ominous gloom over the world. In Egypt, Dionysius exclaimed, when that preternatural darkness at the height of noon made the stars visible, that “the God of the universe was either suffering, or expressing sympathy with some one enduring unequalled suffering.” We read not that this visible testimony of the displeasure of the Ruler of nature awakened any feelings of compunction or remorse in the bosoms of the relentless persecutors, or reflected any light upon their minds. With some, however, it had this effect, for they returned to the city smiting their breasts, declaring the innocence of Jesus, but the rest waited on in sorrow, or in unmitigated cruelty, expecting the end.

The paschal lamb of the Jews was to be slain, according to the law, at three o'clock; and when that hour came, He whose great sacrifice, now to be offered up, gave symbolic efficacy to that ritual worship, cried out with a loud voice, in the words of the 22d Psalm, “My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me?” This was the agonized voice of human nature, crushed down with sufferings far more intense than man could ever have endured. It was no regret at now being compelled to drink that cup of severest sorrow, for he had already expressed his acquiescence in the Divine will; and we must take the whole sentiments of that prophetic Psalm, as either having been then also uttered, or expressly understood and felt in our Saviour's soul—His confidence in God, who, he knew, would not leave the soul of his Holy One in hell, nor suffer him to see corruption—His anticipation of the glory and triumph that lay beyond the horrors of that dark valley of death into which he had now descended. The Jews thought that Christ was calling upon Elijah to come to his deliverance, and requested the soldiers to give him a drink of vinegar, to enable him to bear up under the pains of that excruciating death, in some expectation of seeing a miracle. This bitter draught was the fulfilment of the last prophecy connected with the tragic scene of the cross; and when he had tasted it, he declared that the object of his suffering was accomplished; and, crying with a loud voice, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,” he bowed his head, and closed his eyes for ever upon all his incomprehensible sufferings. That last voice of his suffering human nature shook the solid pillars of the earth, as the agony of his soul had clothed the heavens in portentous darkness. Insensible nature was conscious of the horrid cruelty of man—the earthquake made

the solid mountains tremble—the rocks were rent, and the caverns of the grave were thrown open*—the vail which covered the most holy place of the temple from every eye, and concealed symbolically from the sight of the profane the mysteries of the Mosaic dispensation, was rent from top to bottom; intimating, that all had now their accomplishment, and that all the ceremonial rites of the law were to be substituted by the perfect and spiritual righteousness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Such testimony, from every region of nature, and from her sympathizing elements, could not be without their effect—the Roman centurion expressed his conviction that this was indeed the Son of God, renounced his military profession, it is said, and died a martyr to the Gospel;—the multitudes, who had been urged by their rulers to that frantic rage, returned in desponding sorrow and remorse at their own cruelty; and that noisy whirlwind of destructive fury, which was a necessary instrument to execute the fore-ordained decree of God, ended in a repentant shower of tears. Not so the more deliberate cruelty, the more unconquerable infidelity, of the priests and rulers. Their malice pursues their victim even to the dark chambers of the tomb. But they cloak that inextinguishable hate with the specious exterior of a sacred motive—reeking, as these remorseless murderers were, with innocent blood, they are about to set themselves to the performance of the most sacred ordinance of their religion, and the now returned light of the sun, and the face of that sacred evening, must not be polluted by the presence of dead bodies, or their sanctimonious scruples offended by their inhaling of a wandering breeze that might have passed over the crosses of Calvary. They obtain the authority of Pilate to make the work of death secure, and to seal and set a watch over the tomb, lest any deception should be practised upon the people by the disciples of that Deceiver, as they now assured themselves they had proved Jesus to be. They obtain all their requests—the soldiers break the legs of the malefactors, and put an end to their sufferings; but as they knew that Jesus was already dead, they only pierced his side with a spear, and even in this minute particular, the fulfilment of the symbolical prophecy regarding the sacrifice of the true Paschal Lamb was realized, that “a bone of him was not broken.” This ritual command in regard to the type was given in reference to the antitype, who was to rise again so soon from the slumbers of death. The piercing with the spear was also predicted by Zechariah, and the circumstances mentioned in connexion with it prove that the sentence of death was fully undergone.

“Earth and hell have done their worst”—we use the language of the pious Bishop Hall—“O Saviour, thou art in thy paradise, and triumphest over the malice of men and of devils—the remainders of thy sacred person are not yet free. The soldiers have parted thy garments, and cast lots upon thy seamless coat. These poor spoils cannot so much enrich them as glorify thee, whose scriptures are fulfilled by their barbarous sortitions. The Jews sue to have thy bones divided, but they sue in vain—no more could thy garments (not) be whole than thy body broken—one inviolable decree overrules both. Foolish executioners! ye look up at that crucified body, as if it were altogether in your power and mercy—nothing

* It is said, that many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came into Jerusalem, and were shown of many. But it is added, that this was after the resurrection of Jesus. He was the first-fruits of the grave, and the resurrection of these others was a pledge to us of the truth of the doctrine. It is not said whether these risen saints, the living proofs of his victory over death, ascended with him into the heavenly Jerusalem, or remained on earth, and again submitted to the lot of humanity. In either way, they were monuments of the dominion of Him who held the keys of the grave—who had conquered death, and who was to give life and glory to every soul that comes to Him.

appears to you but impotence and death—little do ye know what an irresistible guard there is upon that sacred corpse, such as if all the powers of darkness shall band against, they shall find themselves confounded. In spite of all the gates of hell, that word shall stand, ‘Not a bone of him shall be broken.’”

Earth and hell have indeed done their worst—but, more mysterious still, the sword of God has been unsheathed in righteous vengeance against the rebellion and sin of earth and hell—it has smote to death the fellow and equal of God—the divine displeasure has been poured out upon the only-begotten Son of the Eternal Father—the Shepherd is slain, and the sheep scattered abroad, apparently the helpless objects of the devouring malice, or haughty contempt, of the rulers of the Jews. We can ill conceive the mingled feelings of grief and personal disappointment that must have overwhelmed the high hopes and ardent minds of his followers. Whatever were the thoughts of despondency or of vague expectation among his Apostles—however paralyzed they were by terror and grief, there were still disciples prepared to show affectionate regard to those unconscious remains which yet hung on the Cross of Calvary. Joseph of Arimathea anticipated even the cruel hatred of the priests—he begged the body of Jesus from the Roman prætor. He, along with Nicodemus, took down the body, embalmed it hurriedly, laid it in the tomb which he had hewn out of the rock for his own place of final repose, rolled a stone to its entrance, and left it in sorrow to observe the rite of the Passover, which now was no longer necessary; or, rather, which was fraught with meaning of a far higher and more spiritual deliverance. The priests, also, were not inactive—they must have had some misgivings of mind in regard to the result of their guilty doings of that day. They remembered Christ’s prediction of his rising again on the third day; and, to prevent this, which they saw would be worse than their allowing him to follow out his course uninterrupted, they begged permission to set a watch of soldiers upon the grave, till the period foretold should have elapsed. They obtained their request, and added another link to the chain of proof that Jesus, whom they had “crucified and slain,” was in truth their Messiah. The guard was placed—the tomb was sealed, and they now retire, with what triumph they might enjoy in their imagined, but guilty success, to celebrate the praise of that God who had delivered their fathers in days of old, and who had now wrought out an unconceivably more glorious deliverance for them, which, with incredible rebellion against their divine Sovereign, they had rejected, to the destruction of their nation, and to the perdition of their own souls.

The Star of Jacob seems now to have passed away, the Anointed of Judah has fallen upon the mountains of his strength, the Son of David has left the earth, and his sceptre is yet in the hand of the stranger—the idol banner of abomination and desolation still rests in the victorious security of insulting pride upon the sacred hill of Zion. The brief records left by the Evangelists tell us not what were the thoughts of the helpless and unlearned Apostles—what were their communings as to their future schemes, when thus deprived, contrary to all their hopes and wishes, but certainly in accordance with all the predictions of the oracles of God from the beginning of time, and with the nine times repeated, and solemn declaration of their Master, that thus it was to be. We can easily imagine their alternations of hope and doubt, and suggestions of despair, while that Passover of sorrow to them was celebrated with unwonted joy by the priests. Sorrowfully and in double gloom must that night of lonely bereavement have sunk down upon their souls—the sacred dawn of the day of holy rest must have brought no consolation to them, and in

hopeless doubt and fear must they have discharged its incumbent duties. Their Head was gone, and if they did enter the courts of the temple, it was not with the confidence of men who felt that they were under the guidance of a wisdom which could, with consummate ease, put to silence, or instruct the most learned of the teachers of their nation—under the protection of a Power which had shown resistless command over nature, and over the minds of men, and the enmity of evil spirits. If they went thither, it was only to bear the now triumphant taunts of lawyer and scribe, of Pharisee and priest, that they had asserted and proved their authority, against all attempts of a deceiver of the people. However anxious we might be to know—however instructive we might think it, were it recorded, what were the reasonings or declamations of the teachers of Israel—what were the surmisings of the congregated thousands of the expectant tribes—what were the musings and resolutions of the disappointed and bereaved followers of Jesus of Nazareth, it is not recorded, and we are left to imagine.

That internal gloom and natural despondency had been forgot in the exultation of the day-spring of joy that was soon to disperse the gathering shades of their sorrow—those fears, the off-spring of feeble faith and groundless despondency, were soon to be lost in the spring-tide of exultation which a few short hours were to bring round. The affectionate zeal of the female followers of Jesus was not satisfied with the hurried embalming which had been performed upon the body of their beloved Master. They had bought sweet spices upon the evening of the Passover, and, when the Jewish Sabbath was over, they had procured more, and several of them, Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James and Salome, along with others, came forth before the darkness had yet cleared away, to perform, as they thought, the last rites of regard and devoted affection to the sacred remains. Amid the terror of the disciples, or their own uncalculating haste, they did not reflect upon the dangers and difficulties which lay before them. The rude soldiers were there, at their night-watch, and the ponderous stone, sealed with the sacred signet of the high priest, lay at the gate of the tomb. But while they went, in the simple affection of pious duty, the period had elapsed during which the bonds of death were destined to hold the Conqueror of sin and death under their dominion. His soul returned from the bosom of his heavenly Father, in the glories of the paradise above, and had re-entered its now glorified tabernacle of flesh and blood. But as at his departure into the rest of heaven from the agony of Calvary, the universe showed signs of sympathetic sorrow, so now the elements again announced their consciousness that a mighty hand was stirring them into commotion. An angel descended to open that ponderous gate of death. The earth was again shaken, and trembled at the return of Him who created and sustained it—the warriors of flesh and blood were paralyzed in helpless terror at the sight of the celestial panoply and refulgent brightness of the warrior angel of the host of heaven, and the lightning which flashed from his countenance, and they became as dead men. The stone was rolled away, and the messenger of heaven sat upon it, till the Son of man came forth from that bed of pain and humiliation, now the couch of victory and glory. The military watch recovered the use of their strength so far as to flee in terror and confusion from such a miraculous scene, and to report, to those who had given them their commission, the failure of all their attempts—that Jesus of Nazareth was risen from the dead. This sign, which Christ, in the days of his patient instruction, and striving with their obstinate unbelief, had repeatedly promised to give them, should have made these proud rulers pause, and

re-examine the grounds of their own rejection of Christ as their promised Deliverer, and those upon which, by so many infallible evidences, He had proved his right to that title. Instead of this, it only induced them the more to shut their eyes against the light of that truth; they bribed the soldiers to propagate the incredible story, that the weak and unarmed followers of Jesus had stolen the body, while a guard of sixty warriors were guilty of the capital crime of sleeping upon their post! The angel, after their departure, seems to have entered that dark and narrow abode of death, to muse upon the place where the Lord of angels had lain so mysteriously under the power of the ruthless conqueror of the sinful children of Adam. We need not attempt to describe the disappointment of these pious women, when they found all their affectionate preparations vain—their return to the city, in anxious doubt as to the cause of the grave being empty—the lingering of Mary Magdalene—her interview with her risen Saviour—the gracious declaration of the angel, that their crucified Master was risen—the commotion among the apostles and disciples at hearing the report of the women—their running to ascertain its truth—the gradual dawning of new hope on their minds, when they examined the condition of the tomb, and compared the evidence of the women with the oft times repeated prediction of their Master, that He would rise on the third day—which now began to return to their recollection, and revive their spirit. Their hopes had been of worldly ambition, notwithstanding all the efforts of Jesus to undeceive them, and instruct their minds aright. They seem to have buried these, despondingly and forever, in the grave of their crucified Lord, and were probably preparing soon to return to their homes in Galilee, and to resume their humble occupations, from which they had been called to accompany Him, who, they never doubted, was the Son of David, and the predicted Saviour of his people.

This seems to have been the state of anxious feeling, between troubled doubts and vague hopes, of the two disciples who were leaving Jerusalem for the village of Emmaus. In that sad colloquy, they reviewed all they had seen, and heard, and expected, and were in danger of coming to the desponding conclusion, that their hopes had been all a fond and delusive dream, when their risen Master himself joined them, in disguise, in their sad journey, and, in a long and affectionate remonstrance, explained the Scriptures to them, proving that all these mysterious events, which so perplexed their understanding, were exactly predicted, and, instead of overthrowing their belief, ought to be the very grounds upon which they should rest it in triumphant assurance. At the end of their journey, He revealed himself to them, as he blessed the bread and gave it to them, as he had been accustomed to do. To show that the work of preaching His Gospel was now to be left to themselves—that He was no longer to go about among the people openly as their Master—he disappeared from their sight. After such an occurrence, they could not persist in their object, whatever that was—they returned immediately to Jerusalem, to inform the rest of their company of what they had seen. Here they found the Eleven gathered together, in confused consultation upon the occurrences of that eventful day. Besides the appearance and declaration of the angel, and the interview which Christ had with Mary, he had also met Peter, and this new announcement of the other two filled them with additional wonder and amazement. But, instead of the ardent credulity of overjoyed minds at such wonderful intelligence, we are informed that they still doubted, or hesitated to give their belief to the reality of the resurrection. It seemed too joyful intelligence to be received or comprehended at once.

It was now evening, and the Apostles were gathered together, speculating upon these accounts, with the doors locked, for fear of an attack from the Jews. In the midst of these perplexed discussions, Jesus himself suddenly stood among them, and gave them his usual salutation, "Peace be to you." From the circumstance of the doors being locked or bolted, they thought that this must be a spirit; but he spoke to them, showed the wounds of the nails in his hands and feet, and that of the spear in his side. Overwhelmed with excess of joy, and doubting still, in the mingled tumult of surprise and wonder, he requests them to bring some food—stops with them till they broiled a fish, which was brought for supper. To convince them that he really possessed the same nature as themselves, in which they had seen him before, he partook of it along with them, blessed them again, breathed upon them, and communicated the gift of the Holy Spirit, and gave them the power of forgiving sins, or rather of proclaiming to repentant sinners the terms upon which God would forgive them.

Such were the events of the first day on which our divine Conqueror arose victorious over sin and death. When he ascended up on high from the six days' work of creation, attended by the jubilant hosts of heaven—when he looked abroad with his all-seeing eye over the new-born universe, rejoicing in the light of his countenance, and pronounced it very good, he is represented as resting from his work, and being refreshed; but, when he arose from the bed of death, which brought the hope and certainty of life and eternal salvation to a guilty world, dead under the sentence of the law, and the curse of sin, he did not rest, nor return to the glories of that kingdom which he had now made his own, by the most glorious victory which the history of eternity can ever record—over the mystery of which the blessed spirits of heaven can ever wonder, and learn subjects of more profound adoration. No; he went about still for many a day, instructing his disciples in the doctrines of his gospel—explaining to them the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies which pointed to himself—the meaning of all those ceremonial rites which had a typical meaning, and a temporary use, thus preparing them for laying the foundations of His spiritual kingdom over all the world. High and holy reason have Christians, in all ages, to rest from the labours and distractions of this busy world on that day, and in solemn and solitary meditation, or in the united acclaim of praise, the fervent supplication of prayer, and the docile attention of believing minds, to listen to the word of truth, which alone can make them free from the bondage of this world, and give them the liberty of the children of God, of joint heirs of that kingdom over which their Saviour now reigns.

He had still to contend with the slowness of his disciples to believe. Thomas had not been witness to any of the appearances of his Master related above, and he was resolved to give no credit to the fond story of the women, whom he seems to have considered to be in a too agitated and terrified state of mind to report accurately,—neither would he rest his faith upon the report of the rest of the disciples. Unless he saw the wounded hands and side of Jesus, and put his hand into the print of the nails, and of the spear, he would persist in believing that they were deluding themselves with a visionary creation of their own fancy. His infidelity and punctilious doubts have been employed to add greater certainty to the proof of the resurrection of Christ to all generations. On the first day of the following week, when all the Eleven were again met together at meat. Jesus appeared in the midst of them, reproved Thomas especially for his reluctance to believe what had been so often foretold, and requested him to prove, by the test which alone he de-

clared would convince him, that the resurrection of his Master was no delusion. The doubting Apostle was now abashed at his own slowness of conviction, and expressed his belief, not only of the resurrection, but also of the divinity of Jesus—"My Lord, and my God!" exclaimed the humbled and adoring penitent. He was accepted, and gently reproved by Him who knew the hearts of all men, and could sympathize with their sinless weaknesses.

The festival-week of the Passover was now past, and the disciples and apostles, according to the request of Jesus, and the message of the angel, returned into Galilee, where their Master had particularly promised to meet them, on a mountain which he named. They employed themselves in the meantime at their old occupation of fishing. Peter, and the sons of Zebedee, along with some others, had spent all the night unsuccessfully, as on a former occasion, when they were called to leave their nets, and become fishers of men. As at that time, Jesus again stood on the shore of the lake, and directed them where to cast their nets—they obeyed, enclosed a miraculous draught of fishes, and recognized their Master. The zealous Peter leaped into the water in the ardour of his affection, and came first to salute him. He requested them to prepare food, and again ate with them. Peter had thrice, in the hour of persecution and terror, denied his knowledge of Jesus of Nazareth, and his connexion with him, thus virtually renouncing his apostleship. This was greater cowardice and more open desertion than any of the rest had been guilty of, though they had never made such ardent professions of attachment as the bold Galilean fisherman. His Master was now to show that he was forgiven, and his office restored and confirmed to him. But it was necessary to teach him a lesson of humility, and a distrust in his own courage and strength of resolution. Thrice had Peter denied and renounced his Lord before the world—thrice did Christ put to him the pathetic question, "Whether he loved him?"—thrice did the humbled Apostle appeal to the knowledge of Him who knew all hearts, as to the reality and depth of that love, and thrice did he again receive the charge, to feed the lambs and the sheep of Christ. Being thus restored, Jesus foretold to Peter the way in which his faith and patience should be tried, and the manner in which he was to follow him. The warm-hearted Apostle being restored to his Master's confidence and love, at this moment thought not of those sufferings which were set before him, but was anxious to learn the fate of John, whom, he knew, Jesus loved so tenderly, and whose gentler nature he seems to have thought was more unfit than his to contend with a hostile world. The reply of Jesus was a check upon this prying curiosity into the condition and fate of others, but conveyed an intimation that John was to escape that terror of the cross, through the whole scene of the suffering of which he alone of the Twelve seems to have stood near his Lord.

We do not know how frequently Jesus met with his disciples, how long he conversed with them on these occasions, or in what strain of instruction he now grounded them fully in the understanding of the doctrines which they were to teach so soon to the Jews, and to all the world. That they had yet many prejudices and much ignorance of the real nature of that spiritual kingdom of which they were to be the founders, we have all along had frequent opportunities of seeing; that these slowly disappeared, even after the death and resurrection of Jesus, is very evident. He therefore remained on earth forty days after he rose, and conversed with them upon the doctrines which he had often preached before, and which they would be now more fully prepared to understand. But he had many disciples in Galilee besides his immediate followers, and the time was now come when he was to show himself to these. He had appointed the place and the time, and we have

reason to believe that on this occasion the five hundred, mentioned by Paul, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, enjoyed the happiness of witnessing their crucified Saviour alive after his resurrection. He conversed with them, removed all their doubts and fears, and encouraged them with the assurance that all power was committed to him. This was an amply sufficient number of chosen witnesses to prove the truth of that resurrection, upon the reality of which, the great Apostle of the Gentiles was willing to peril the whole truth of the doctrines which he preached with such confidence and zeal.

But the Feast of Pentecost, the festival in which they offered the first-fruits of their harvest, and which the rabbis observed also in commemoration of the giving of the law, was at hand, and Christ had appointed to meet with his disciples at Jerusalem. He here again finally opened up the Scriptures to them, removed their doubts, and encouraged their hearts for the work which was before them. They were to remain at Jerusalem till the Holy Ghost should be given—there were they to commence their labours, but from that city they were to spread the knowledge of his name to the uttermost parts of the earth. Having given his last instructions, he led them out to the Mount of Olives. In proof of the fond attachment with which they still clung to their hopes of worldly glory, they asked Jesus if he was not now about to restore the kingdom to Israel? He discouraged the question, as an unprofitable subject of inquiry, one of those deep mysteries which God has reserved to himself, and wisely concealed from the knowledge of man. But he informed them that a much more glorious power was conferred upon him, than that of any, or all of the kingdoms of this world—all power in heaven and on earth was given him. To them he delegated that power anew, bestowed upon them the gift of working miracles, and commanding them to preach his Gospel over all the earth, and to baptize into his name all who believed, promised to be with them to the end of the world.

But those hills which had witnessed his triumphant procession to the temple, and had echoed to the Hosannahs of the joyous multitudes—those valleys which had often sheltered him, when the inhospitable city of Jerusalem gave him no place of rest, which had witnessed his agony of ardent prayer in the garden, were now to be the scene of his triumphant ascent to the open gates of the celestial palace of the King of kings. He had now accomplished the great work which had been decreed in the councils of eternity—he had demonstrated the unchangeable holiness of God, and the eternal justice of his law—he had encountered the author of all evil in the sinless strength of the nature of man, who had yielded to the temptation, had rebelled and fallen—in his own usurped kingdom, and by his own instruments, he had vanquished the enemy of God and man, had seen him fall like lightning from heaven—he had opened the prison doors, or had rescued the prisoners, and led the captives into the freedom of his own kingdom; and now, instead of dwelling behind the vail of the temple, and giving forth his temporary ordinances to that chosen people who had so long been his witnesses, and the depositaries of his revelations and laws for the government of the world, that vail had been rent from top to bottom, when the final cry of agony announced that his suffering humanity had yielded up his spirit, and those guardian cherubim of glory who had dwelt for so many ages in symbolic meaning, as they bent down in mystic contemplation on the mercy-seat, which contained the law of Sinai, had ended their long watch; and, while the earth trembled, and the temple shook, had cried, "Let us depart hence." He who had created all things for his own glory, who had instituted these elementary and preparatory dispensations of spiritual truth, was now to ascend that throne of

government which he had possessed from eternity, but which was henceforth to be exhibited in a new and a clearer light of righteous judgment to all the principalities of the universal kingdom of God. But how strange the contrast ! He is about to leave that world which he had come to enlighten and save ; and who are they that are to enter upon the work of perfecting—nay, even of commencing—that conquest, and extending it not merely over the boundaries of the narrow land of the chosen tribes, but over every nation on the surface of the whole earth ? Are these few poor illiterate fishermen, and tentmakers, and publicans of Galilee, the conquering army which is to defy the might of worldly power in its palmy grandeur ? are they to cope in argument with the learned of the schools of ancient tradition—to eclipse the noonday splendour of the philosophy of Greece—to introduce a perfect system of laws which shall subvert the legislative wisdom of Rome, the ruler of the world ? Yes—these are the only instruments which He has chosen to extend his conquests, and spread his wisdom, and establish his truth over the earth. Having known, and chosen, and loved these humble followers from the beginning, he loves them to the end. He had now given them their commission, and while he lifted up his hands and blessed them for the last time, he was parted from them, and ascended into heaven. He needed not the fiery chariot of the Lord, like Elijah—He who could walk over the stormy billows could as easily ascend through the infinitude of the empyrean sky. The bright cloud of celestial glory—the divine Shechinah which had led the wandering tribes through the wilderness, and afterwards dwelt in the holy place of the temple, now for ever left the earth, and received the King of glory into the dazzling splendour of its effulgence. The rapt Apostles gazed after their ascending Lord in fond expectation of his immediate return ; but two of that angelic host, who delight to minister to men, warned them that it was a final departure, and that Jesus of Nazareth would come again as he had ascended.

Up he rode,
 Followed with acclamation, and the sound
 Symphonious of ten thousand harps that tuned
 Angelic harmonies : the earth, the air, resounded.
 The heavens and all their constellations rung ;
 The planets in their stations listening stood,
 While the bright pomp ascended jubilant.
 Open, ye everlasting gates, they sung,
 Open, ye heavens, your living doors ; let in
 The great Redeemer, from his work returned
 Magnificent ; and oft, for God will deign
 To visit now the dwellings of just men,
 Delighted, and with frequent intercourse,
 Thither will send his winged messengers,
 On errands of supernal grace.

So sung he, who, of all the uninspired sons of men, if we may call him uninspired, struck the harp of Zion to its sublimest strain, and made it utter intellectual music of heavenly power, when he sung of the creation and fall of man—and all Scripture leads us to the conclusion that the jubilant songs of these angelic harps, which are never unstrung, were more joyous and triumphant, when the mighty Conqueror, returned from his painful work of the salvation of a world, re-entered the uplifted gates of the palace of heaven, and resumed his seat on the right hand of the Majesty on high. The Son of the King has, indeed, to the eye of his faithful followers, gone into a far country, to secure a kingdom, with a promise to return, and reward those who served him with loyal and faithful heart. Those bereaved servants are left apparently forlorn and homeless ; but it is not so. Thenceforth,

the Spirit of His truth, and of His power, was to dwell within them—as far as they, and their labours and duties, were concerned, heaven and earth were now one. They no longer saw him with the eye of the body, through the impenetrable depths of that unapproachable glory, which no created eye can look upon and live; but they know that his omniscient eye is upon them, and his presence ever around them, and his wisdom and power within them. While on earth, he was the Man of sorrows—now he reigneth over all, and his disciples have his own infallible assurance, that, when the predicted times and seasons, which are now wisely hid from the curious and fond conjectures of man, shall come round, he will reconstitute this redeemed world into a kingdom, in which righteousness alone shall dwell, and that by means of those humble instruments whom he has appointed as the earthly vicegerents of his authority. We shall borrow the graphic description of this accomplished victory of the doctrines of the cross, as transcribed from the sure record of prophecy by another poet of our own, as an appropriate conclusion to this short account of the life and doctrines of JESUS CHRIST.

O scenes surpassing fable, and yet true—
 Scenes of accomplished bliss ! which, who can see,
 Though but in distant prospect, and not feel
 His soul refreshed with foretaste of the joy ?
 Rivers of gladness water all the earth,
 And clothe all climes with beauty ; the reproach
 Of barrenness is past. The fruitful field
 Laughs with abundance ; and the land once barren,
 Or fertile only to its own disgrace,
 Exults to see its thistly curse repealed ;
 The lion, and the libbard, and the bear,
 Graze with the fearless flocks ; all bask at noon
 Together, or all gambol in the shade
 Of the same grove, and drink one common stream.
 All creatures worship man, and all mankind
 One Lord, one Father. Error has no place—
 That creeping pestilence is driven away—
 The breath of heaven has chased it. In the heart
 No passion touches a discordant string.
 But all is harmony and love. Disease
 Is not ; the pure and uncontaminate blood
 Holds its due course, nor fears the frost of age.
 One song employs all nations, and all cry,
 “ Worthy the Lamb, for he was slain for us.”
 The dwellers in the vales, and on the rocks,
 Shout to each other, and the mountain-tops
 From distant mountains catch the flying joy ;
 Till nation after nation, taught the strain,
 Earth rolls the rapturous Hosanna round
 Behold the measure of the promise filled ;
 See Salem built, the labour of a God !
 Bright as the sun the sacred city shines ;
 All kingdoms, and all princes of the earth,
 Flock to that light—the glory of all lands
 Flows into her ; unbounded is her joy,
 And endless her increase. Upon her walls,
 And in her streets, and in her spacious courts,
 Is heard salvation. Her report has travelled
 Into all lands—from every clime they come
 To see thy beauty, and to share thy joy,
 O Zion ! an assembly such as earth
 Saw never—such as Heaven stoops down to see.

[A LIST OF ALL THE NAMES OF THE PERSONS MENTIONED IN THE SACRED WRITINGS, OF WHOM NOTHING IS KNOWN, IS GIVEN AT THE END OF THE VOLUME, WITH THE HEBREW AND SYRIAC INTERPRETATIONS, AND THE REFERENCES TO THE BOOKS AND PASSAGES IN WHICH THEY OCCUR.]

A

AARON was the son of Amram and Jochebed, of the tribe of Levi, and brother of Moses, who was three years younger. He was born in Egypt the year before the promulgation of the celebrated edict to extirpate the Hebrew male children by one of those Pharaohs of the new dynasty who "knew not Joseph," and the date of his birth, therefore, is computed to have been in the year of the world 2430, and B.C. 1574.

Nothing is known of the early history of Aaron, and he had attained to what is commonly accounted old age before he entered on the public duties for which he was commissioned in conjunction with Moses, being eighty-three years old when he appeared before Pharaoh to demand the release of the Hebrews. Some have conjectured that he held a kind of official appointment to superintend his countrymen in the performance of the tasks assigned them by the Egyptians—an idea which may probably have originated from the circumstance that, as he was the great-grandson of Levi, the son of Jacob, who was the immediate head of the tribe, his birth would procure for him even from the Egyptians some office of importance. Aaron married Elisheba, who bore to him four sons—Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar.

During the residence of Moses at the court of Pharaoh, where he was educated under the inspection of the king's daughter, and also during the sojourn of his brother in the country of the Midianites in the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai, Aaron remained in Egypt, where he witnessed and doubtless participated in the cruelties and exactions which the Hebrews were compelled to suffer from the Egypt-

But during this long interval he

was prepared to aid Moses, as his advocate, interpreter, and prophet, in his intercourse with Pharaoh, previous to the emancipation of the Israelites from their bondage. When Moses saw the wonderful manifestation of the Divine Presence in the bush "which burned with fire and was not consumed" on Mount Horeb, he was referred to Aaron, who was to be his "spokesman unto all the people," and he was told that the latter was actually on his way to the peninsula of Sinai to meet him, and that when he saw him he would be "glad in his heart." From the intimations given by Moses we may infer that Aaron was a man of remarkable eloquence, while the great Hebrew legislator hints at his own deficiency in that respect, which induced him at first to express a wish to decline the high office to which he had been appointed.

While Moses was thus solemnly appointed in the rocky desert of Sinai to the perilous task of accomplishing the release of the Israelites, Aaron, who was still in Egypt, received a Divine communication ordering him to proceed directly to that peninsula, and meet his brother Moses. The brothers met at Horeb, called the "Mount of God," and after the most affectionate salutations unfolded to each other the extraordinary commissions they had received, and the peculiar nature of their connection with each other. They returned together into Egypt, resolved to commence without delay the arduous task to which they had been appointed, strong in the protection and support of the God of Abraham, who had chosen "Israel for his portion, and Jacob for his inheritance."

The two brothers journeyed from Sinai

along the shores of the Gulf of Suez in the Red Sea—that Gulf through which the emancipated Israelites were soon to pass miraculously in triumph, and from the opposite shore of which they were to witness the complete destruction of their tyrannical oppressors. We may easily conceive that their conversations would be peculiarly solemn and interesting while travelling together, connected with the extraordinary appointments they had received, for it does not appear that either of them had any precise idea of what was to be done in Egypt through their agency, beyond the general fact that they were to have considerable intercourse with Pharaoh, to accomplish the deliverance of the Israelites, and to lead them to the country long promised to their Patriarchal ancestors. Entering Egypt by the isthmus of Suez, the brothers proceeded immediately to the district called Goshen inhabited by their countrymen, whom they found groaning under the most severe oppression. They convened the heads of the tribes and families together, and Aaron addressed them on the occasion, recounting the whole of the circumstances which occurred to Moses at the Mount of God; and, as a proof of the authenticity of their commission, he produced the rod which the latter held in his hand at Horeb when he first received the Divine command, and did sundry signs with it, which completely convinced the Hebrews of the reality of Aaron's declarations, and that their bondage would soon be terminated. The inspired historian finely remarks—"The people believed, and when they heard that the Lord had visited the Children of Israel, and that he had looked upon their affliction, then they bowed their heads and worshipped."

The two intrepid Hebrews, having received the unlimited confidence of their countrymen, now sought an interview with the king of Egypt. They were admitted into his presence, and unfolded the nature of their application. They informed him that they were commissioned by the Lord God of Israel to

demand permission to go with all the Hebrews three days' journey into the desert of Sinai, that they might there render a solemn sacrifice, and that they were afraid of some disastrous personal consequences to themselves if they were prevented. We thus see, in the conduct of Aaron and Moses with respect to Pharaoh, that mild entreaty was first employed, and that what was latterly demanded and obtained as a right was in the outset requested as a favour. Perhaps there was in this deferential request to the king some allusion to their former condition in Egypt. The Egyptian sovereigns had treated the Hebrews as guests rather than as subjects, until the entrance of that foreign dynasty of monarchs who were ignorant of or disregarded the services which one of their ancestors had rendered to the nation. Yet even those kings had not changed their peculiar form of government, and they had still continued a distinct people. On the contrary, certain Hebrews, called *shoterim*, in the English version rendered *officers*, were employed under the direction of the Egyptian overseers to apportion and press forward the labours exacted from the people.

The request of Aaron was treated with contempt by Pharaoh, who, a believer in the Egyptian idolatry, knew nothing of the Great Being whose name had been invoked, and whose authority he consequently altogether disowned. To show still farther his resolution, he alleged that Moses and Aaron, by their influence over the Hebrews, had infused a proneness to idleness which ought to be punished, and that the request to go and sacrifice in the wilderness was a mere pretext to procure so many days of indolence and relaxation. Pharaoh, therefore, ordered the overseers not only to be more vigilant in superintending the Hebrews, but they were no longer to supply them with material for the making of bricks. They were to procure straw for themselves wherever they could find it, yet the quantity, or "tale," of bricks which they had been compelled to make was not to be diminished

It appears that the Israelites during their bondage were chiefly occupied in making bricks, for the erection, doubtless, of some of those pyramids composed of that material which still exist in Egypt. Of this description are the brick pyramids at Dashoor and Faïoum. In this country we are so much accustomed to associate the making of bricks with burning, that an ordinary reader will probably be at a loss to discover the purposes to which the straw mentioned in the text could be appropriated except to burn the bricks. It is necessary to observe, however, that it is still one of the existing customs in the East, as it was in ancient times, to mix straw with the clay in making undried bricks, which renders them compact and extremely durable in dry climates like that of Egypt, though they would be soon ruined if exposed to rain. Such bricks were of course never in the fire, but dried in the sun; and in the ancient remains both of Babylon and of the Pyramids, composed of such bricks, it is remarkable that the straw by which the clay was rendered compact has sustained little injury or discoloration.

The Hebrews heard of this order in the utmost consternation, and remonstrated against its injustice, but the overseers, instead of commiserating with them, or endeavouring to procure a repeal of Pharaoh's injunction, treated them with ridicule, and even subjected them to personal chastisement. The circumstance of the officers of the Israelites being beaten when they expostulated with their oppressors affords a curious illustration of Oriental despotism, practised to this day in China, Persia, and the adjacent countries. In those countries men of all ranks and ages, even the highest and most trusted persons in the state, are continually liable to be beaten in a moment of displeasure or caprice by their sovereign, yet this is regarded by all not as a disgrace, but as a misfortune—one of the common evils to which life is subject; for a nobleman or minister of state, who has been severely beaten one day by order of his capricious master, may still

retain his place and influence at court, and may be invested with a more valuable robe of honour the next. A few kind or complimentary words are considered by all parties as an adequate compensation for the punishment inflicted.

The Hebrews next tried Pharaoh himself, to whom they represented the hardships of their condition, but all the reply they got from him was an assurance that no straw would be given them, yet they were to deliver the usual quantity of bricks. "Ye are idle, ye are idle," said the inflexible despot, "therefore ye say, Let us go and do sacrifice to the Lord." The deputation met Aaron and Moses on their return, whom they unhesitatingly accused of being the authors of their new calamities, and whom they upbraided in no gentle terms for their interference with them at all. The brothers appear to have offered no reply or apology, and both retired utterly at a loss to account for the Divine procedure, which seemed to them to be at complete variance with the solemn assurances of deliverance they had received.

The events which followed, and the infliction of the ten celebrated plagues on the Egyptians, are generally associated with the life of Moses, who seems in all the interviews which he and Aaron had with Pharaoh to have been the chief leader, while Aaron was the speaker—his brother being by his own account incapable of addressing the king on account of some impediment of speech, for which the Orientals assign many causes. The rod of Aaron was the sign employed in working divers miracles—and the stretching of it with extended arm was the signal for the infliction of some of those extraordinary plagues which struck terror into the hearts of the Egyptians, and terminated in the destruction of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea.

Aaron and Moses, having accomplished the deliverance of the Hebrews in the year of the world 2513, according to the Bible chronology, and 1491 years before the Christian era, were now at the head of an immense multitude of men, women,

and children, on the Arabian side of the Gulf of Suez in the peninsula of Sinai. In the repeated rebellions of the Israelites, we find Aaron, as associated with Moses, receiving his share of their ungrateful reproaches; but he nowhere appears so conspicuous throughout the narrative of the Hebrew wanderings as his illustrious brother. When the manna was given to the Israelites, Aaron was ordered to take a pot, and put an omer full of the miraculous food into it, which he laid up before the Testimony to be kept sacred, that distant generations might see the bread with which their ancestors had been fed after their emancipation from Egyptian tyranny.

The Amalekites, who inhabited the regions in the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai, were the first enemies whom the Hebrews had to encounter. Moses entrusted the command of a chosen band of warriors to Joshua, to enter the field against those Amalekites, while he retired, accompanied by Aaron and Hur, with the rod of God in his hands, to the top of a hill, whence he had a complete view of the scene of action. Here a very singular incident influenced the result of the battle. When Moses held up his hand the Israelites prevailed, and when, on the contrary, he let down his hand the victory inclined to the Amalekites. It does not appear whether the Divine interposition was known to Moses before the commencement of the action, or that he had any particular instructions as to the attitude and motion he was to exhibit, but the effect was visible on the contending parties; and, to ensure the total defeat of the Amalekites, Aaron and Hur placed Moses in a sitting posture on a stone, and stood on each side of him, holding up his hands, when he could no longer do so himself of his own accord. Joshua, in consequence, gained a decisive victory over the Amalekites, who were routed with great slaughter.

We now come to that part of the life of Aaron, during the peregrinations of the Hebrews in the wilderness, when he and his sons exercised the office of priests by

Divine appointment, and, as soon as the Tabernacle was built, when Aaron was consecrated by Moses, and invested with the pontifical ornaments. Here there is great difficulty in separating the narrative from that of the life of Moses, with which it is most intimately connected. The Hebrews, in the third month of their progress after the departure from Egypt, came to Mount Sinai, and encamped before that celebrated mountain. Here Moses was summoned to receive the Law, and when on the Mount, enjoying converse with Jehovah, he was directed to go down, and return with Aaron; but he was cautioned to prevent the priests and the people from attempting to ascend the mountain, otherwise they might be certain of most signal punishment. The transactions in the Mount of God, the delivery of the two Tables of the Decalogue, and of the civil and criminal code of the Israelites, are considered in their proper place in the history of Moses. On this occasion Aaron, accompanied by Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel, attended Moses on the Mount, but Moses alone was permitted to behold the Divine glory. The inspired historian informs us, however, that they all "saw the God of Israel; and there were under his feet, as it were, a paved work of a sapphire stone, and, as it were, the body of heaven in its clearness, and upon the nobles of the Children of Israel he laid not his hand; also, they saw God, and did eat and drink."

Though this account must be taken in a general sense, and not understood as if they literally saw the great Jehovah, but rather the inexpressible glory which accompanied His divine manifestation on the holy Mount, the description, nevertheless, conveys the most solemn and magnificent impressions, and suggests thoughts which may well be imagined, but which it is impossible to express. The wild and sterile scenery by which they were surrounded—the stupendous mountains and rugged precipices which every where encircled them—in short, the time, the place, and the occasion, combined

with the extraordinary and incomprehensible glory which they were witnessing, would naturally inspire them with the deepest awe, and excite in them the most overwhelming emotions. They saw Jehovah in those signs of his manifestation, and yet were in health and soundness of body. But to Moses was assigned the high honour of more intimate access to the presence of Jehovah. He was summoned farther up the Mount, to receive the tables of stone, and the Law, and the commandments which had been graven by the hand of Omnipotence, and he obeyed the command, attended, as he informs us, by his "minister Joshua," while he ordered the elders to remain where they were until he and Joshua came again unto them, deputing Aaron and Hur to decide in any important matters connected with the people during his absence. The cloud indicating the presence of the Divine Majesty covered the lofty peaks of Sinai, resembling "devouring fire at the top of the Mount, in the eyes of the Children of Israel, and Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and gat him up into the Mount, and Moses was in the Mount forty days and forty nights."

While the great Hebrew legislator was absent during this interval, he received the commands and directions of Jehovah respecting many important matters, enumerated in the Book of Exodus, from the 25th to the 31st chapter inclusive. It was on this occasion that Aaron and his sons were ordered to be set apart for the priesthood—the holy garments were appointed—the ephod—the breastplate with twelve precious stones—the Urim and Thummim—the robe of the ephod, with garments and bells—the plate of the mitre—the embroidered coat—the garments for Aaron's sons—the sacrifice and ceremonies of consecrating the priests—the altar of incense—the ransom of souls—the brazen laver—the holy anointing oil—the composition of the perfume. The whole was accompanied by a renewed command to observe the Sabbath. Moses received the two tables, and the promise was again given that Jehovah

would continue his protection to his chosen people.—"I will dwell among the Children of Israel, and will be their God: and they shall know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them; I am the Lord their God."

But the time which Moses remained in the Mount of God at length exhausted the patience of the ever restless Hebrews, and notwithstanding all that they had experienced of the Divine favour, and though the Divine presence was still exhibited before their eyes in the cloud which rested on the lofty summit of Sinai, they involved themselves in an extraordinary criminal affair of which they induced Aaron to become the leader. Moses had been more than a month absent on the Mount, and the Israelites despaired of his return. They knew well that he had been the agent in effecting their deliverance from Egypt; his continued absence began to perplex them; and as their priesthood and regular religious services had not yet been promulgated or established, they resolved to institute a system of their own, or to make their new principles partially to coalesce with the practices with which they were familiar. The Israelites were deeply infected with the idolatry of Egypt, and as Apis, or the living bull, was one of the most conspicuous objects in that system, we can easily account for the direction taken in the first apostacy from Jehovah. They applied to Aaron, whose easy compliance has been extenuated by some Jewish, Mahometan, and Christian writers, but of whose serious culpability in the whole affair there can be little doubt, as Moses himself subsequently informs us (Dent. ix. 20), "And the Lord was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him, and I prayed for Aaron also the same time," namely, when he prayed for all the people. It is indeed possible that he may have been impressed with the general belief that Moses was dead, and that he shrank from the task of attempting to control a multitude, of whose unruly inclinations and dispo-

sition he had been often a witness. In the sequel the reader will find various traditions and conjectures, preserved especially among the Mahometans, respecting the conduct and motives of Aaron, more especially in reference to the manner in which he met their proposal in the first instance, by demanding their precious personal ornaments—their “golden ear-rings, which were in the ears of their wives, their sons, and their daughters,” with which to manufacture the image, in the hope that their selfishness and reluctance to part with these valuables would induce them to relinquish their intention. But their zeal was not to be thus subdued or repulsed. The universal exclamation was, “Up, make us gods which shall go before us, for as for this Moses, the man that brought us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.” In their exclusive application to Aaron they admit the authority with which he was invested, and seem to have beheld him as their responsible leader in the absence of his brother.

The demand was irresistible, and their enthusiasm was such that they readily complied with Aaron's demands, and brought their valuable personal ornaments to be appropriated to the manufacture of the idol. They brought their ear-rings as he required, and the passage evidently indicates that it was then customary among the Hebrews for the men as well as the women to wear ear-rings. Those ear-rings were of Egyptian workmanship, and probably part of the spoils which the Hebrews obtained from the Egyptians at their memorable departure from the country. It appears from ancient Egyptian drawings and sculptures of females, preserved in the British Museum, that those ear-rings were not such as are common amongst us, but round plates of metal with a thick border closely fitted to the ear, as is often the case at present in the East, where they are generally thick, and in some instances so large and heavy as greatly to distend the lobe of the ear, and disagreeably enlarging

the orifice made for the insertion of the ring. But it appears that ear-rings were not commonly worn by the Hebrews in subsequent periods. In the Book of Judges (viii. 24) the reason assigned for a spoil of ear-rings taken by Gideon was, “because they were [taken from] Ishmaelites;” and although the Arabs wore them in the time of Mahomet, they afterwards relinquished the ornaments, which were chiefly used by women. This may have resulted from the prohibition in the Koran—“Whosoever likes to put into the nose or ear of his friend a ring of hell fire, tell him to put on a gold ring; and he who wishes to put on the neck of his friend a chain of hell fire, tell him to put on a chain of gold; and he who wishes to put on rings to his friend's wrists of hell fire, tell him to put on golden ones; wherefore be it on you to make your ornaments of silver.” It thus appears that Mahomet, while he allowed the use of silver ornaments, prohibited those of gold, and there is probably only one instance in which he tolerated the use of gold, which illustrates the antiquity of artificial noses. One of his followers had his nose cut off in a battle, and he made a nose of silver, which soon became soiled, when Mahomet advised him to make a nose of gold, which would always be pure and clear to the eye.

The figure which Aaron made for the Israelites was a golden calf—a fact which clearly indicates their predilection for the idolatry of Egypt as a system to which they had been long accustomed, and with which they had become strongly tainted. We are told that “he fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf.” This description, as given in our translation, is very obscure, and it probably means that he fashioned the mould of it with a graving tool, and afterwards made a molten calf. There are many conjectures as to this idol—some contending that only part of it, or the head, was of gold; and others maintaining different theories in reference to the formation of its other parts. It is remarkable that this is the earliest in-

stance on record of the art of forming a statue in this manner, which appears to have been formed after the Egyptian models, both as a work of art, and as an idol, for Moses expressly informs us in another place (Deut. xxix. 17), that the Egyptians had idols of "wood and stone, silver and gold." In this respect, therefore, the account of the golden calf made by Aaron is peculiarly interesting. The idol would probably exhibit the primitive form of statuary, because in all likelihood the art of casting in moulds, which men would be taught by observing the shapes assumed by soft substances when they came in contact with compact and solid bodies, preceded that of sculpture. Metallic personal ornaments were perhaps the first results of the hints thus afforded by observation; and these would lead to the casting of images and other objects which had formerly been composed of different materials. It is almost unnecessary to remark that instances of molten images are common in the history of all the ancient idolatries.

When the idol had been finished by the direction of Aaron in imitation of what they had seen in Egypt, it was introduced in this remarkable manner to the Hebrews, "These be thy gods [or this is thy god], O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." The reader will here observe that the idolatry of the Israelites on this and other subsequent occasions did not consist in worshipping a false deity, but in making what they intended to be a sensible and visible representation of the true and living God. This is evidently indicated from the transactions relative to it which immediately followed. Aaron erected an altar before the idol, and ordered a proclamation to be made throughout the encampments of the tribes, that the following day was "a feast unto the Lord"—not to the golden calf, but to the Creator of the world, whom they worshipped in this image. There was, therefore, no utter apostasy on this occasion from Jehovah to the idols of Egypt, for if they had wholly forsaken the true

God they would have felt little interest in his festival on the following day, but their criminality consisted in the intrusion of Egyptian ideas and practices into the worship of Jehovah, and purposing to render this worship through a sensible symbol. This view of the transaction is supported by an observation of the Psalmist in reference to this very image, in which he tells us that the Israelites changed the glory of the invisible Jehovah into "the similitude of an ox that eateth grass"—a desecration directly contrary to the Divine command. Other passages of Scripture also justify this view of the matter. On all occasions in the subsequent history of the Hebrews the worship of the golden calf is mentioned in the strongest terms of reprobation, because, although not in its first intention an act of entire departure from God, it was a great step towards final apostasy, inasmuch as the mind would soon become familiarized with images as symbols or representatives of Jehovah, introduced under the idea of doing him honour, or of diminishing the distance between the worshippers and the worshipped, by the intervention of a sensible image, and consequently the entire transition to new gods and new images was easy. This actually happened by the addition of the Ten Tribes—who worshipped the golden calves set up by Jeroboam in Dan and Bethel—to Baal and Moloch, and other idols of the neighbouring nations. "In after times," observes Archbishop Secker, "when the kings of Israel set up the same representation of the true God at Dan and Bethel, the Scripture constantly speaks of it as the leading sin, from which all the rest of their idolatries and at last their utter destruction proceeded. For, from worshipping the true God by an image, they soon came to worship the images of false gods too, and from thence fell into all sorts of superstition, and all sorts of wickedness."

The Hebrews on the following morning duly obeyed the proclamation issued by Aaron. They "rose up early,

and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings, and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." The festival was succeeded by revelry and mirth, the Hebrews expressing their joy and satisfaction by music, dancing, and other signs of joy. We are told that when Moses came upon them suddenly in the midst of their hilarity, he "saw that the people were naked, for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame among their enemies," or, as the latter clause is rendered in the marginal reading, "*among those that rose up against them.*" It is not certain whether we are to understand the description *naked* as indicating that the Hebrews were literally in a state of nudity. Their wanton mirth resulted from their idolatrous worship, and it is undoubtedly expressed in the original Hebrew by a word which is sometimes applied to other kinds of wantonness, idolatry being frequently compared to such illicit intercourse. Dr Hales urges that after the unhallowed sacrifice they had risen up to wanton play, singing and dancing according to the obscene Egyptian rites, by which Aaron "made them naked to their shame." Others view their condition as figurative, and indicating that the Hebrews were deprived of the Divine protection, Aaron having rendered them liable to the scorn and assaults of their enemies, who would have found them in no posture of defence, and under no proper direction or command, but scattered up and down whether inclination or folly led them.

While the Hebrews were thus conducting themselves under the leadership of Aaron, his brother was still absent on the sacred Mount. But in this mysterious retreat, overshadowed by the glory of Divine Presence, Jehovah informed his faithful servant of the proceedings of the the Israelites, denouncing against the whole of them the most summary vengeance, and intimating that He would transfer his promises to Moses himself.—"Now, therefore, let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and

that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation." But the intercession of Moses averted the Divine wrath. In obedience to the command of Jehovah he descended from Mount Sinai, carrying with him the two tables of the Testimony, and accompanied by Joshua, who does not appear to have been aware of the conduct of the Hebrews. When they descended the rugged sides of the mountain, and came within sight of the congregated encampment, they heard the loud shouts of mirth and dancing raised by the Hebrews, which Joshua, in noticing them to Moses, supposed to be indications of war in the camp. Moses, however, informed him that the noise proceeded from a different cause—it was neither the noise of victory nor of defeat, but the noise of unhallowed mirth and idolatrous folly.

The golden calf was instantly destroyed by Moses, whose sudden appearance astonished the Hebrews, and put a stop to their amusements. We are told that he took the image and burnt it; he then ground it to powder—probably, as Stackhouse conjectures, by means of a file, or by beating it out into thin plates; and he threw the whole into water, and made the Hebrews drink it—not that he literally compelled them, but as they had no other water they could not avoid drinking that which contained the refuse of their image. Even in this there was a lesson of reproof and instruction. He cast the dust into the water which the thirsty Israelites had received not long before out of the rock in that dry and barren place, thus upbraiding their ingratitude for committing a grievous sin near the very spot where they had received a most signal benefit.

The indignant leader now turned towards his brother Aaron, and asked him what could have induced him to become a party to this transaction. He is directly charged with being the principal in the crime, to which he replied in an excusatory manner, but in language very submissive, chiefly throwing the blame upon the people, and giving a most confused

account of his own share in the matter, as if conscious of guilt, yet afraid to avow it. A severe punishment followed, inflicted by the Levites on those most prominently concerned in the worship of the golden calf, three thousand of whom were put to death. Moses returned to the holy Mount, to renew his intercessions for the Hebrews.

Aaron evinced sincere penitence for his transgression, and received the Divine forgiveness. When Moses returned from the Mount with the two tables renewed, the tabernacle was ordered to be erected, Aaron was consecrated, and his sons set apart for the sacerdotal office. The whole of this remarkable service is minutely narrated in the two last chapters of the Book of Exodus. It appears from the account given by the inspired writer, that the distinctive dress of Aaron as high priest consisted of eight articles, some of which were peculiar to him, and others common to all the priests. The ephod was a kind of close robe or vest reaching from the shoulders to the loins, made of a rich cloth of fine linen, and embroidered with blue, purple, scarlet, and gold. The girdle of the ephod was probably of the same materials as the ephod itself, and was that by which the garment was confined round the body of the high priest. Two onyx-stones, containing each the names of six tribes, and set in ouches or sockets of gold, were placed one on each shoulder, and the bindings above the shoulder had the name of shoulder-pieces, and were probably of the same rich cloth as the ephod. The robe of the ephod was a long gown—whether of linen or woollen is not agreed—of light blue, reaching, some allege, to the middle of the leg, and others to the feet; it was all of one piece, with an opening at the top to permit the head to pass through, and this opening was strongly hemmed round to prevent its being rent. This robe was without sleeves, having merely holes in the sides for the arms. Figures of pomegranates, wrought with blue, purple, and scarlet yarn, ornamented the skirt at the bottom of the robe, and bells

were hung between them, or there were alternately a bell and a pomegranate, the number of which is not mentioned by Moses, and hence a variety of opinions has existed on this point—seventy-two being the number most commonly stated, though others contend that there were as many small bells as there are days in the year. These bells were of gold, but the object of them is not very clear. We are told that “it shall be upon Aaron to minister, and his sound shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not.” This certainly indicates that the sound of the bells was to be considered as announcing his approach to the Divine Presence, and it probably indicated that he was arrayed in his proper pontifical robes, the ministering without which incurred the penalty of death. Whether the sound of the bells served to remind the people of the particular offices in which the high priest was engaged, as in the case of the Roman Catholic service, is not so evident, but an inference to this purport is allowable; and perhaps the ringing of a bell during the celebration of mass in that ritual was adopted analogically, from this peculiarity in the Jewish service.

It is to be observed, in this sketch of Aaron's pontifical vestments, that the inferior priests also in process of time, though not originally, wore ephods, but they were distinguished from that of the high priest by being plain linen. Samuel also wore one, though he was only a Levite. We read of David, who was not a Levite, dancing before the ark arrayed in one, and some commentators contend that the Hebrew kings were privileged to wear them.

The breastplate which Aaron and his successors were commanded to wear above the ephod was to be made “after the work of the ephod, of gold, blue, purple, and scarlet,” namely, it was a piece of rich cloth, of the same embroidered stuff as the outer robe or ephod. It was set with twelve precious stones, one for each tribe of Israel, and we are informed

by Josephus, that these precious stones for size and beauty placed this ornament beyond the purchase of men. The embroidered stuff of the breastplate was doubled, that it might more firmly hold the precious stones set in it, and when thus doubled it was nine inches square. At each corner there was a ring of gold, to the two uppermost of which were attached wreathed chains of gold, which fastened the breastplate to the shoulder-pieces of the ephod; and the two under rings were fastened to rings in the embroidered girdle of the ephod by blue laces.

The *Urim* and *Thummim* next deserve our attention. In the instructions given to Moses he was thus directed—"And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the *Urim* and the *Thummim*; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart when he goeth in before the Lord; and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." On the subject of these remarkable words—*Urim* signifying *lights*, and *Thummim* denoting *perfections*—there has been much learned and ingenious speculation. It is to be observed, that there is not the least intimation throughout the Scriptures what they really were, beyond the general notice that it was by them the high priest obtained responses from God, nor is there any direction given for making them, as there is for the rest of the holy garments of the Hebrew pontiff. Josephus, who is followed in his statement by several judicious interpreters, says that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were precious stones of the high priest's breastplate, which discovered the will of God by their extraordinary lustre, and thereby predicted the issue of events to those who consulted them. The Jewish historian adds, that it was two hundred years at the time he wrote since those stones had left off showing that lustre, so that this oracle had ceased about one hundred and ten years before our Saviour's time; but this is a mere fallacy, for it is certain that there are no intimations in the Scriptures which warrant us to con-

clude that God was consulted by *Urim* and *Thummim* from the time of the erection to the destruction of Solomon's Temple, and it is universally admitted that it did not afterwards exist. An examination of the different texts in which they occur evidently supports this conclusion of their identity with the precious stones of the high priest's pectoral. In the description of it in the Book of Exodus (xxxix. 8-21), the precious stones are mentioned, while the *Urim* and *Thummim* are altogether omitted, and in the Book of Leviticus (viii. 8) the latter are expressly noticed, while the former are not introduced or specified. Aaron was directed to wear the names of the Tribes "upon his heart before the Lord continually," and we find in another passage that he was also directed to wear the "*Urim* and *Thummim* upon his heart before the Lord continually."

Let us compare this reasonable and apparently proper account with what is advanced by several writers, both ancient and modern. Epiphanius and Suidas argue that, in addition to the twelve precious stones of the breastplate there was a diamond of extraordinary beauty, which indicated to the high priest, by its remarkable lustre, whether Jehovah was favourable to the enterprise for the issue of which he was consulted. Procopius and others place two additional stones in the pectoral, which they think were the *Urim* and *Thummim*—an opinion censured by St Augustine, who disapproves both of the additional stones, and of their alleged miraculous splendour, because the Scriptures are silent on the subject. St Cyril is inclined to think that words indicating *manifestation* and *truth* were written on two precious stones, or on a plate of gold, in the breastplate; and others, that the words *Urim* and *Thummim* were written in embroidery on the pectoral between the rows of the stones and two borders, one above, and the other below. A Rabbi named Solomon believes that the name *Jehovah*, written on a plate of gold, was the *Urim* and *Thummim*. Gesenius and others imagine that they were small

oracular images, like the *seraphim*, personifying *revelation* and *truth*, which were placed in the inner cavity of the breastplate. Spencer maintains that they were two little golden figures shut up in the breastplate as in a purse, which gave responses, and answered with an articulate voice the questions put to them by the high priest. Le Clerc supposes that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were the names of some precious stones which composed a great collar hanging down on the breast of the high priest, which might be imitated from the Egyptians, whose chief officer of justice wore about his neck a figure of truth engraved on precious stones, and hanging by a golden chain. There is, however, little analogy apparent in this last hypothesis; and, besides, the jewel worn by the ancient Egyptian judges was exclusively judicial, but the *Urim* and *Thummim* of the Hebrew high priest was oracular and sacerdotal, as well as judicial. The idea that they were borrowed from the customs of the idolatrous Egyptians cannot be entertained for a moment. On the whole, the statement of Josephus seems the most consistent and probable.

While on this subject it may be here remarked, that the manner in which the Divine Will was manifested to the high priest has given rise to many equally fanciful conjectures, but it is altogether unknown how God answered by *Urim* and *Thummim*. It is already observed, in citing the statements of Josephus and of the Jews generally, that it was done by the shining of the stones on the breastplate engraved with the names of the Tribes, the dimness or the lustre of which enabled the high priest to read the response in or reflected from them. A common opinion also is, that the *Urim* and *Thummim* merely put the high priest in a condition to receive the responses, which were given in an audible voice from between the cherubim, when he applied in the legitimate manner. The mode, however, in which the high priest acted is sufficiently plain. When any emergency occurred for which no

provision was made in the Law, he arrayed himself in his pontifical garments and breastplate and went into the holy place, where, standing close before the veil, but not entering within it, he stated the question or difficulty, and received an answer. It is farther agreed that the high priest was not allowed to perform this solemn consultation for a private person, but for the public welfare and common interest of the Twelve Tribes whose names he bore on the breastplate.

But to return to the description of Aaron's pontifical garments—we find that the inmost of the sacerdotal vestments was a long robe with sleeves to the waist; nevertheless, this was not peculiar to the high priest, but was similar to that worn by the inferior priests when officiating. There was also a "girdle of needle work," which was a piece of fine twined linen, embroidered with blue, purple, and scarlet, encircling the body. Josephus informs us that it was embroidered with flowers—that it was four fingers in breadth—that after being twice turned round the body it was fastened in front, and the ends allowed to hang down to the feet on common occasions—but that the priest threw them over his left shoulder when officiating at the altar. Another Jewish authority states that the girdle was only three fingers broad, and considerably longer than is mentioned by Josephus—and that it was carried, like the Oriental girdles in general, a number of times round the body. The ordinary priests wore the girdle over the embroidered coat, which formed their outer garment. Linen breeches, or more properly *drawers*, were also ordered to be made, which were to reach from the "loins to the thighs," for the ancient Jews, like the modern Arabs and some other Oriental nations, seldom wore trousers or drawers. A Jewish writer informs us that the drawers worn by the priests reached from above the navel to the thighs, and that they had no opening before or behind, but were drawn up round the body like strings in a purse. The Turks, Persians, and other Orientals,

wear similar linen drawers at the present day, very wide, and fastened tight round the body by a string or girdle drawn through a hem in the upper border, but they reach a little below the knee.

We have now only to consider the mitre, which was a turban of fine linen, with a plate of pure gold in front attached to the turban by a blue lace, and on this plate were inscribed the words, **HOLINESS TO THE LORD, OR, HOLY TO JEHOVAH.** The signification of the word would indicate that the plate was wrought with flowered work, or perhaps was itself in the form of a flower or petal. Turbans of fine linen were the usual diadems of ancient kings, and they were usually ornamented in front with gold or precious stones.

Such were the robes of the Hebrew pontiffs, and from the importance attached to them, the assertion of the Rabbins, that without them a priest had no more right than a private person, or even a foreigner, to officiate at the altar, seems sanctioned by Scripture. In the account now given of the pontifical vestments worn by Aaron and his successors, it will be seen that there were certain robes common to all the priests of every condition. There were the turban, the embroidered coat, the girdle, and the drawers, but in addition to these, which the high priest also wore, he alone had the privilege of wearing the ephod, the robe of the ephod, with its alternate bells and pomegranate, the breastplate over the ephod, the shoulder-piece of onyx-stone, and the engraved ornament of pure gold in front of his mitre or turban. What became of the old robes of the high priest, when it was necessary to supplant them by new ones, is nowhere mentioned; but the old robes of the priests were unravelled and burnt as wicks for the lamps at the Feast of Tabernacles.

The ceremonies performed at the consecration of Aaron and his sons are minutely detailed by Moses in the Book of Leviticus. It was done by Moses himself in obedience to the Divine command. Shortly after the consecration a severe

affliction befell Aaron. Two of his sons, Nadab and Abihu, became signal monuments of the Divine vengeance, on account of their offering "strange fire before the Lord." We are told that "there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord." We are not to understand, however, that their bodies were literally reduced to ashes. So far from this being the case, even their vestments were not consumed, and at the command of Moses they were carried dead "in their coats out of the camp" by their relatives, the sons of Uzziel, their father's uncle. It is supposed by some that too free indulgence in wine or other strong drink led them to this act of rashness and disobedience for which they were punished with death, and it is also alleged that the crime itself consisted in an unauthorized attempt to enter the most holy place, which was an encroachment on the peculiar prerogatives of the high priest; but it seems more probable that their crime consisted in offering *strange or common fire*. To explain this it is necessary to observe, that on the occasion of the consecration of Aaron, "there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat." This fire, miraculously kindled on the altar, was to be kept up continually on the altar of burnt-offering, and from it the fire was to be taken to burn the incense offered morning and evening on the golden altar. Aaron's two unfortunate sons had procured fire in their censers from a different quarter—probably from the fires at which the portion of the sacrifices intended for the use of the priests was dressed for food in the court of the tabernacle. Whence the fire proceeded which caused their death does not appear. They died by a kind of suffocation, or as if struck by lightning, which often destroys life without injuring the clothes, or leaving any marks of violence on the body. Aaron, we are told, "held his peace" on this awful occasion, namely, he submitted in silence to the judgment upon those very sons who had recently been honoured, in

preference to the others, of being with him and Moses, accompanied by the seventy elders, on the holy Mount, and who must have heard the denunciations uttered against those who broke the ordinances then delivered.

In a subsequent part of the progress of the Hebrews through the peninsula of Sinai, we find Aaron combining with his sister Miriam against Moses, on account of his marriage with Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro. The text informs us that Zipporah had been very recently brought to her husband, with whom she was left by her brother Hobab, and it is probable that Aaron and Miriam dreaded the influence which the fair Arabian might exercise over Moses. Miriam was afflicted with leprosy for a few days as a punishment for her conduct in the affair, and Aaron was severely reprovèd; but they both confessed their fault, and were forgiven.

The rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram followed, but as Moses was perhaps more prominently attacked than Aaron in this remarkable sedition, the reader will find it considered in the life of Moses and elsewhere. Aaron was the agent in staying the plague which ensued, and which caused a serious mortality among the Hebrews. He was ordered to "take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement." On ordinary occasions incense could only be offered on the golden altar within the holy place, but on this remarkable emergency an extraordinary remedy was provided. Aaron went out into the camp with the incense, and placing himself "between the living and the dead," namely, between the part where the destruction raged, and that which it had not yet reached, the plague ceased on his offering incense and making an atonement. That Jehovah could have stopped the plague without the intervention of Aaron no one will dispute, but at this particular crisis it was probably the Divine will that a most convincing and decisive

proof should be given of Aaron's just title to the priesthood, for he was not only protected when offering incense with Korah's associates, but he was made the instrument of preserving others from destruction.

This is the last remarkable transaction recorded in the life of Aaron. The Hebrews continued their journey until they came to Mount Hor, and here he was ordered to resign his office of high priest, and to prepare for death. Like Moses, he was not permitted to enter the Promised Land on account of his conduct at the rock of Meribah, when the Hebrews were reduced to great distress for want of water. He was led to the summit of Mount Hor, which rises conspicuously above the surrounding rocks in the vicinity of Petra, the ancient capital of the Edomites, by Moses, accompanied by his eldest son Eleazar; and here he was divested of the pontifical garments, which were put on Eleazar, who thus became his successor. No particulars are recorded of his death, but the text seems to indicate that he died in the presence of Moses and Eleazar before they returned to the Hebrews. When the fact was announced to them a general mourning was held, which continued thirty days.

The tomb of Aaron is still pointed out on Mount Hor, at the supposed spot where the first high priest of the Hebrews lay down and died, and from which his eye could mark out much of that wild region through which his nation had wandered for many years. The tomb is enclosed by a small modern building crowned with a cupola, such as usually covers the remains of Moslem saints. It is held in the greatest veneration by the Mahometans and Arabs, who offer sacrifices to *Haroun*, as they designate Aaron, and the animal devoted for the purpose is generally a goat. Burckhardt, in his Moslem guise, was a party to one of these sacrifices; and he informs us that while engaged in it his Arab guide constantly uttered such exclamations as the following—"O Haroun, look upon us! It is

for you we slaughter this victim. O Haroun, protect and forgive us! O Haroun, be satisfied with our good intentions, for it is but a lean goat! O Haroun, smooth our paths, and praise be to the Lord of all creatures!"

Aaron died on Mount Hor, near the encampment of Mosera, B.C. 1453, according to the Hebrew chronology, and in the hundred and twenty-seventh year of his age. From his two surviving sons, Eleazar and Ithamar, was continued the race and succession of the Hebrew high priests. The Jews fix the day of his death, and the observance of it, on the first day of the fifth month Ab, which nearly corresponds with our July.

The particulars related of Aaron by the Mahometans are of little importance, and are evidently all borrowed from Moses, embellished with some of their own fancies. These are noticed in the life of the distinguished Hebrew legislator.

The character of Aaron as exhibited to us by Moses suggests some practical reflections. The author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus (xlv.) thus mentions him: "Moses consecrated him, and anointed him with holy oil; this was appointed unto him by an everlasting covenant, and to his seed, so long as the heavens should remain, that they should minister unto Him, and execute the office of the priesthood, and bless the people in His name. He chose him out of all men living to offer sacrifices to the Lord, incense, and a sweet savour, for a memorial, to make reconciliation for His people. He gave unto him His commandments, and authority in the statutes of judgments, that he should teach Jacob the testimonies, and inform Israel in His laws." Though the elder brother of Moses, he appears chiefly as his assistant and inferior, yet he was his superior in eloquence, and was likewise favoured with Divine inspiration. But he appears to have been deficient in natural firmness, as is proved in the affair of the golden calf; for nothing can palliate his violation of his duty on that occasion, or justify the apparent readiness with

which he entered into the design. His quarrel with Moses, to which he was excited by his sister Miriam, indicates that he could be too easily persuaded against his own judgment, and was liable to be swayed by erroneous and irritating representations. Nevertheless, we trace in his character much of the meekness of Moses, his conduct marked by sincere piety, and a disposition at all times willing to serve his brethren. The resignation which he manifested when he was informed of the awful fate of his two sons, Nadab and Abihu, is finely introduced by the sacred historian, and is an example of parental submission which cannot be surpassed in any instances of a similar nature. His departure to die on Mount Hor is a singular and impressive scene. "We view in imagination," it has been appropriately remarked, "this feeble old man ascending the Mount to a convenient height, there transferring the insignia of his office to his son, then proceeding beyond the sight of the people, and giving up the ghost with that faith, that resignation, that meekness, which became one who had been honoured with the Holy Spirit, and with the typical representation of the great High Priest himself."

ABDON, AUBDON, or OBDON, was the tenth Judge of the Hebrews before the commencement of their monarchy. He was of the tribe of Ephraim, and judged Israel eight years. No particulars are recorded of his administration, which was probably peaceful and prosperous. The author of the Book of Judges says that he had "forty sons and thirty nephews," who were accustomed to appear in public mounted on as many colts, which intimates that Abdon must have been a man of great influence and wealth in his tribe, otherwise he could not have supported such a numerous household. According to the Hebrew chronology he died B.C. 1156, and was buried at Pirathon, his native place, in his own tribe of Ephraim.

ABEL, the second son of Adam and Eve, was born in the second year of the world. Some have urged that he and

Cain were twins; others, that he was born fifteen years after Cain; and others, again, thirty years. These particulars are noticed simply to show the trifling speculations in which some learned commentators have not scrupled to indulge. The Church of Rome invokes him in worship, and recommends to his notice and favour the souls of the departed! This singular practice, however, does not appear to be of any great antiquity, and the name of Abel is not found in any of the martyrologies preserved by the Roman Church before the tenth century. Some calendars commemorate him on the 25th of March, the reputed day of our Saviour's crucifixion; others on the 2d of January, and others on the 30th of July. It is also said that he is honoured among the Abyssinians on the 28th of December.

The circumstances connected with the murder of Abel by his brother Cain are briefly stated by the inspired historian, and are well known. The two brothers were of different dispositions as well as avocations. In the appointed sacrifice Abel, as a shepherd, offered fatlings of his flock, which Jehovah was pleased to accept in preference to the first fruits presented by Cain. What visible marks of distinction were manifested to Abel—whether by fire from heaven, or by any other means—are not known, but they were sufficient to excite the implacable resentment of Cain, who formed the design of killing him. Having invited him to go into the field he murdered him, and thus the first awful instance was given of that primeval transgression which “brought death into our world and all its woe.” The murder of Abel is occasionally noticed by the inspired writers in subsequent times. Our Saviour designates him *righteous* (Matt. xxiii. 35), and places him at the head of those saints who were persecuted for truth and righteousness. St Paul in his commendation of those holy men of old, who by “faith and patience are now inheriting the promises,” informs us that “by faith he offered unto God a more

excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts, and by it he being dead yet speaketh.” Abel has always been considered as an eminent type of our blessed Saviour, and hence the beautiful observations of the same Apostle—“For ye are not come unto the Mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire—but ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God—and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel,” Heb. xii. 18–24.

Some curious traditions or rather opinions are recorded respecting Abel. It is alleged that Adam was in his 130th year when Cain murdered Abel, and we are told that the inhabitants of Ceylon affirm that a salt lake on a mountain called Columbo consists wholly of the tears which Eve shed for one hundred years together on account of Abel's death. The Rabbins also state that Adam lamented Abel's death the same number of years in the *valley of tears* near Hebron, during which time he was entirely separated from Eve.

There are several conjectures as to the cause of the quarrel between Abel and Cain. Some allege that it originated in an altercation about a daughter of Eve named Auzrun; others insist that it was a dispute about religion. The Targum of Jerusalem relates that the two brothers being together in the field, a conversation ensued between them, in which Cain maintained there would be no future judgment or eternal life, no reward for the good, or punishment for the wicked, and that the world was neither created nor governed by God's mercy. A Rabbi named Jonathan Ben Uzziel also adopts this idea. Abel, on the other hand, denied every assertion made by his brother, and argued that there would be a future recompence for the righteous. The dispute grew warm until it became personal, when Cain fell upon his brother and murdered him. This fiction, ridi-

culous though it is, contains an excellent moral. It sets forth the fatal commencement of religious disputes, and makes the murder of Abel a melancholy omen of the dreadful calamities they would afterwards occasion.

A diversity of opinions exist as to the manner in which Abel was murdered. According to one tradition, already noticed, Satan secretly prompted Cain to kill Abel for the love of Auzrun, and as this made his oblation unacceptable to God, it so exasperated Cain against his brother that the moment they came down from the mountain on which they had offered the sacrifice he flung a stone at Abel's head, which killed him. It is also asserted that Cain tore Abel to pieces with his teeth. Some imagine that Abel was killed with the jaw-bone of an ass, and others that he was murdered with a pitchfork! St Chrysostom declares it was a sword; Irenæus, a scythe; and Prudentius, a kind of hedging bill. It is certain, however, we are gravely informed by a writer, that Abel was neither drowned nor strangled, since the Scripture says that his blood was shed. A Roman Catholic commentator relates that Abel at first defended himself bravely, and got the better of his brother—that he threw him, but did not hurt him—and that Cain rose up and killed him!

These improbable fictions and chimeras require no comment. The following observations by the learned editors of Bayle's Dictionary on the sacrifice of Abel and Cain are well expressed, and worthy of notice:—"Moses indeed speaks of God's regard to Abel's offering, and of his disregard to that of Cain, immediately after he has related that they offered, but it must not be inferred from thence that the marks of approbation instantly followed their offerings. It is very probable that in time only they came to know—Abel that he was regarded, and Cain that he was not. Abel prospered, his flock increased: Cain, on the contrary, did not prosper, the earth did not yield him a plentiful harvest. These were the means by which God manifest-

ed his approbation of Abel's offering, and his disregard for that of Cain—this it was that embittered the envious Cain against his brother, and seeing him blessed in a particular manner, far beyond what he was himself, he resolved to kill him. According to this hypothesis, it is easy to understand why God *had a respect* for the offering of Abel, and not for that of Cain, namely, because Abel was virtuous, and made his offering with a sense of religion, whereas Cain, being vicious, the ceremonial part of his religion could not be acceptable to God."

As we are simply told that "Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof," these words have caused considerable discussion among commentators. Some argue that he actually killed and made a burnt-offering of the "firstlings," while others contend that he simply offered milk or cream. Those who maintain the divine origin of sacrifices adopt the one view, and those who take the opposite view, among whom we find Grotius and Le Clerc, support the other. The controversy on the general subject has been ably treated by learned writers of both parties, to whose works the reader is referred. The Jewish Rabbins are of opinion that Abel's offerings were burnt-offerings, alleging that these were the only sacrifices in use before the time of Moses—that they were permitted to every private person—and that the Jews even allowed the heathens to offer them in the Temple of Jerusalem.

ABIATHAR, tenth high priest of the Hebrews, was the son of Abimelech his immediate predecessor, who, on account of favour shown him by David, was put to death by Saul with eighty-five priests. Abiathar escaped this massacre and fled to David, in whose reign he was high priest, and often gave that monarch repeated proofs of his fidelity, particularly during the rebellion of Absalom, when he took away the ark. But at the accession of Solomon, Abiathar embarked in the cause of Adonijah to raise him to the throne, which so exasperated Solomon

that he deprived him of the high priesthood, and banished him. The prediction to Eli was thus remarkably fulfilled in his person.

ABIGAIL, the wife of an avaricious, petulant, and arrogant individual of great wealth named Nabal, whose residence was at Carmel—not the Carmel on the Mediterranean, but a place so called in the territory of Judah not far from Hebron. When David was in the Wilderness of Maon, keenly pursued by Saul and reduced to great distress, he sent messengers to Nabal requesting in the most courteous terms that he would supply him with provisions. Mr Matthew Henry, in his well known Exposition of the Books of the Old Testament, thus explains David's message in the modern way—"Tell Nabal, I sent you to present my service to him, and to inquire *how he does and his family!*" But he afterwards censures David for what he considers his too great condescension. "David, methinks," continues Mr Henry, "passed too high a compliment upon Nabal when he called him *the man that liveth*. David knew better things—that in *God's favour is life*, not in the world's smiles." Nabal returned a rude insulting answer, from which it appears that he was a supporter of Saul's party—"Who is David? and who is the son of Jesse?" Mr Henry's remark on this contemptuous reply is as freely expressed:—"By Nabal's rough answer David was well enough served for the too smooth address to such a *muck-worm*." It appears also that Nabal's conduct was not more civil towards the messengers, whom he accused of being a set of idle banditti who had come to prey upon his substance. When David was informed of Nabal's irritating refusal, he declared that he would exterminate him and all his house, and ordered four hundred men to arm themselves for that purpose. This resolution was communicated to Abigail, a woman of great beauty and address, who immediately proceeded to David's camp with an ample supply of provisions, and succeeded by her mild and prudent conduct in calming

his resentment against her husband. David was so pleased with Abigail, that after the death of Nabal, which occurred shortly afterwards, he sent messengers to her, informing her that he intended to make her his wife. She at first excused herself on the ground that it was too great an honour, but she afterwards consented, and David married her the year that Samuel died. The author of the French work entitled "*Histoire du Peuple de Dieu*," concludes a very eccentric account of this affair, which he gives with all the ease of a modern story, in this manner—"She caused five maidens who had been long in her service to attend her, then mounting her ass, she arrived soon after David's envoys in the desert of Paran. The nuptials were there celebrated with less magnificence than suited the dignity of the husband, but with an abundance of celestial blessings infinitely preferable to the transient pomp of kings."

ABIHU, the brother of Nadab, both sons of Aaron, who were privileged to accompany their father to Mount Sinai, and to behold the glory of Jehovah. What they then witnessed appears to have had little influence on either of them, as they were both shortly afterwards killed in a remarkable manner for putting strange fire into their censers instead of the sacred fire commanded to be used. They were struck dead in the tabernacle, and their bodies were ordered to be carried out of the camp, and honourably interred. Aaron and his two surviving sons, Eleazar and Ithamar, were expressly forbidden to join in the lamentation which this awful catastrophe occasioned.

ABIJAH was son of Jeroboam, the first king of the Ten Tribes. This young prince having been seized with a dangerous disease, his mother disguised herself, and sought out the Prophet Ahijah, to inquire if he would recover. The Prophet plainly told her that he would die, and that he would be the only descendant of Jeroboam who would receive funeral honours, and be lamented by the Israelites.

ABIJAH, also called ABIJAM, 1 Kings

xv. 1, was the son and successor of Rehoboam in the limited kingdom of Judah, after the revolt of the Ten Tribes, and began to reign B.C. 958. We are told that during his short reign of three years he followed the idolatrous practices of his father, on whom the dismemberment of the kingdom left him by Solomon seems to have had little effect. Abijah, prosecuting his father's quarrel with Jeroboam, whom he denounced as an ungrateful rebel, assembled an army of 400,000 men, and marching into the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, encamped on the hill on which Samaria was afterwards built. Jeroboam took the field against him with 800,000 men, collected from all parts of the ten cantonments. Abijah selected a prominent position, and addressed Jeroboam's army, in the hope that the sight of him might revive their loyalty to the house of David, and induce them to return to the worship of the true God; but while he was speaking to those within reach of his voice, Jeroboam ordered a part of his troops to defile behind the surrounding eminences, and enclose the army of Judah, inferior to his own in numbers by one half. Abijah perceived the successful manœuvre when it was too late, and immediately implored the Divine assistance. The priests sounded the holy trumpets, and the troops of Jeroboam became suddenly panic-struck and powerless. In this condition they were attacked by Abijah's army with so much fury that 500,000 men fell in that disastrous assault. The king of Judah, in addition to this victory, took several cities from Jeroboam, who sustained in this campaign a most severe discomfiture accompanied by a grievous loss. Abijah is reproached for not destroying, when it was in his power to do so, the idolatrous altar which Jeroboam had erected at Bethel, and for neglecting to suppress the worship of the golden calf in that city. He was buried at Jerusalem in the sepulchres of the kings of Judah.

The chief point to which it is necessary to draw the reader's attention in the short reign of Abijah is the extraordi-

nary army, in point of numbers, which both he and Jeroboam are said to have collected, the one taking the field with 400,000, and the other with no fewer than 800,000 men. It is to be observed, that many MSS. and printed Bibles reduce the numbers of the contending armies to 40,000 and 80,000—which is certainly a more probable estimate, but the rendering in our version is supported by the Septuagint, Josephus, and some of the best Latin Bibles, both published and manuscripts. Yet the opposing statements are easily reconciled by a reference to the vast numbers which generally composed the Oriental armies; and there is every reason to conclude that the estimate which reduces the armies of Abijah and Jeroboam to 40,000 and 80,000 does not refer to the gross numbers which both armies mustered, but only to the *soldiers*, or *actual fighting men*. The kingdoms of Judah and Israel were certainly small states; they were, however, extremely populous, and it would be easy to show that the composition of Asiatic armies is such as to render credible those numbers which express their gross amount, while no accurate inference respecting the entire population can be drawn from the numbers stated as composing its armies. Of this fact the Baron Du Tott gives us an instance in the case of the Khan of the Crimea. "It may be presumed," says the Baron, "that the rustic frugal life which these pastoral people lead favours population, while the wants and excesses of luxury among polished nations strike at its very root. In fact, it is observed, that the people are less numerous under the roofs of the Crimea and the province of Boodjak, than in the tents of the Noguais. The best calculation we can make is from a view of the military forces which the Khan is able to assemble. We shall soon see this prince raising *three armies* at the same time—one of a *hundred thousand men*, which he commanded in person, another of *sixty thousand men*, commanded by the Calga, and a third of *forty thousand* by the Nooradin. He had the power of raising

double the number without prejudice to the necessary labours of the state."

But Volney's description of an Asiatic army is still more conclusive. "The Asiatic armies," he tells us, "are *mobs*, their marches are ravages, their campaigns are mere inroads, and their battles are bloody frays. The strongest, or the most adventurous party, goes in search of the other, which not unfrequently flies without offering resistance. If they stand their ground, they engage pell-mell, discharge their carbines, break their spears, and hack each other with their sabres, for they rarely have any cannon, and, when they have, they are but of little service. *A panic frequently diffuses itself without cause*; one party flies, the other pursues, and shouts victory; the vanquished submits to the will of the conquerors, and the campaign often terminates without a battle."

ABIMELECH, an ancient King of Gerar, a district of the country of the Philistines, who was contemporary with Abraham. It is conjectured that Abimelech was a royal title of those primitive kings of Gerar, since we find the king called by the same name in the time of Isaac, and his general was designated *Phichol* when both father and son were in the country. The Patriarch and his family being in the country, Sarah, though ninety years of age, so much attracted his notice that he carried her off and resolved to marry her. Abraham might have prevented this transaction if he had honestly declared himself the husband of Sarah, but a kind of timidity influenced him, fearful that he would be murdered, and he gave out that she was his sister, persuading her at the same time to encourage the dissimulation. In this he was to a certain extent stating the truth, as Sarah was indeed his sister, though by a different mother, and not, as Josephus alleges, his brother's daughter. Abimelech believing the statement literally, was thus deceived, but he received a divine warning of the real condition of the parties, and immediately restored Sarah to her husband. His whole conduct throughout

the transaction is highly honourable to him. He reproached Abraham for the danger into which his partial representation of his relationship to Sarah had almost brought him, and assured him that what he himself had done was done in the innocency and integrity of his heart. He subsequently behaved with the utmost kindness and hospitality to the Patriarch, bestowed upon him some valuable presents, and told him that he was at liberty to dwell where he thought proper throughout his dominions. This is the substance of what Moses tells us of this Abimelech. The Rabbins and the Fathers have indulged in many fanciful and indelicate chimeras in reference to the punishment which was to be inflicted, or was inflicted, on Abimelech and his household during the time he detained Sarah. It is evident from the whole tenor of the narrative that he and his people were at this period worshippers of the true God, and followed the same religious rites as the Patriarch and his family. Josephus informs us that after Sarah was restored, Abimelech and Abraham made a covenant together—a circumstance which is not mentioned by Moses. There was indeed a covenant made between them, but it was some years afterwards, at Beersheba. Josephus dates this covenant before Isaac's birth, whereas Moses informs us that it was not till after the expulsion of Ishmael from the Patriarch's family, and this was after Isaac was weaned. These discrepancies of Josephus, who, though professing the Jewish religion, and who ostensibly believed the divine authenticity of the Old Testament writings, have provoked some severe censures against him, which are justly merited. "I declare this once for all," says Bèza, "which can never be proved to be false, that if Josephus be true in a great many places, Moses and all the sacred writers have told a great many untruths. But let us rather esteem these as the true interpreters of God himself, and Josephus not only as very ignorant in religious matters, but as a careless and profane writer."

ABIMELECH, King of Gerar in the time of Isaac, was the successor, and probably the son, of the preceding, as upwards of ninety years had elapsed between the transaction in reference to Sarah and that of Rebekah. Isaac was driven by famine into Gerar. It is likely, as he had heard of the kindness of the former Abimelech to his father, that he would make himself known to his successor, and as he was jealous of the effect of Rebekah's beauty, and alarmed for his own safety, he employed Abraham's artifice, and induced her to pass for his sister. Abimelech believed this dissimulating assertion, which had not the basis of truth on which the statement of Abraham was founded, and he probably would have attempted to secure the fair Hebrew for his harem, but he discovered, in a particular manner, their real relationship, and sending for Isaac, he reprov'd him for his dissimulation, pointing out the consequences which might have ensued. This prince, like his predecessor, appears in a very amiable light, and he prohibited all his subjects, under the penalty of death, from doing any injury to Isaac and Rebekah. The growing prosperity of the Patriarch, however, lost him the king's friendship, and he was very unceremoniously ordered to leave the country. He obeyed, but as his affairs still flourished, notwithstanding the molestations he experienced from the Philistines in several places on account of some wells dug by his servants, Abimelech again desired to make a treaty with him, to which the Patriarch consented. The conduct of Abimelech and his people, in reference to Isaac and Rebekah, intimates that the Philistines at this period held marriage in the utmost veneration, although, as in the case of Dinah, Jacob's daughter, unmarried women appear to have been thought the transient property of any man who happened to address them. St Augustine, in his tracts against Faustus the Manichee, who was always inveighing against the Patriarchs, offers a very just and solid apology for Isaac, which is quoted by a learned French author in a

curious work on the Jews and their amusements.

ABIMELECH, an illegitimate son of Gideon by a concubine whose name, according to Josephus, was Druma. After the death of his father he went to Shechem, the native place of his mother; and his relations, to aid his ambitious views of royalty, gave him a sum of money, which enabled him to hire a band of desperate and unprincipled adventurers, and to put himself at their head. Attended by them he returned to his father's residence, where he put to death seventy of Gideon's legitimate sons by several wives. His design was to cut off all Gideon's descendants, that he might encounter no rival opposition to his schemes, but Jotham, the youngest son, contrived to conceal himself, and escaped. Abimelech now usurped sovereign power, and conducted himself in the most tyrannical manner. Some time afterwards Jotham, having heard that the Shechemites were assembled near Mount Gerizim, proceeded thither, and addressed them from an elevated part of the mountain. In his speech he reproached them for their ingratitude, employing for that purpose the parable of the trees—one of the most ancient allegories on record—who, being desirous to elect a king to rule over them, applied to the olive tree, the fig-tree, and the vine for that purpose, but these indignantly refused, and at length they spoke to the bramble, which accepted the offer, and consented to cover them with its shade. The Shechemites heard this speech in deep silence, and Jotham concluded it by wishing that, if God did not sanction their choice, a fire might go out from them and devour Abimelech; while Abimelech retaliated by wishing that a fire might devour the inhabitants of Shechem and the house of Millo.

This prayer for vengeance on the Shechemites was remarkably fulfilled by Abimelech himself three years afterwards. The Shechemites, weary of his cruelties, and bitterly repenting the murder of Gideon's sons, expelled him from their city, and placed themselves under the

protection of a chief named Gaal, to be secure from his resentments. Nevertheless Abimelech, at the head of a band of followers, marched against Gaal, defeated his army, put all the inhabitants of Shechem to the sword, and completely destroyed the city, sowing the ground on which it stood with salt. He also burnt a tower belonging to the Shechemites, and the temple of their idol *Berith*, in which upwards of a thousand persons of both sexes were consumed. He next invested a city named Thebez or Thebes, but when about to set fire to a tower in which a number of people had taken refuge, a woman threw a piece of millstone at him, which mortally wounded him in the head. To avoid the reproach of having fallen by a woman, which in ancient times, and especially in the Oriental countries, was reckoned a most disgraceful and humiliating death, he ordered his armour-bearer to thrust his sword through him, and he immediately expired.

The reflections of Matthew Henry on the character and career of this ruthless individual are eccentric and curious. "Of this meteor," he says, "this *ignis fatuus* of a prince, who was not a protector, but a plague to his country, we may say as was once said of a great tyrant, that he came in like a fox, ruled like a lion, and died like a dog. We are here (in the Book of Judges) told by what arts Abimelech *got into the saddle*, and made himself great. None would have dreamt of making such a *fellow* as he king, if he had not dreamt of it himself. And see how he *wheedled* them into the choice. How unfit was he to reign over Israel, because unlikely to defend them, who, instead of restraining and punishing idolatry, thus early made himself a *pensioner* to idols!" Our plain-speaking annotator next describes Abimelech's followers:—"What soldiers," he asks, "did he enlist? He hired into his service vain and light persons, the *scum and scoundrels* of the country—men of broken fortunes, giddy heads, and profligate lives; none but such would own him, and they were the fittest to serve his purpose. Like

leaders, like followers." He then pays a handsome and polite compliment to Jotham, whose speech, he assures us, "shows him to be a man of such ingenuity and wisdom, and *really such an accomplished gentleman*, that we cannot but the more lament the fall of Gideon's sons."

Mr Henry's observations on the conduct of the Shechemites are no less eccentric. "The Shechemites," he says, "who set Abimelech up, were the first that deserted him, and endeavoured to *kick him off*. The Shechemites did eat, and drink, and cursed Abimelech, and not only said all the ill they could of him in their table talk, and in the songs of their drunkards, but wished all the ill they could of him. They *drank healths to his confusion*, and with as loud huzzas as ever they had drank these to his prosperity. Well! Gaal's interest in Shechem is soon at an end, and he who had talked of removing Abimelech is himself removed, nor do we ever hear of him any more. *Exit Gaal!*"

"Three circumstances," he continues, "are observable in the death of Abimelech:—1. That he was slain with a stone, as he had slain his brethren, *all upon one stone*: 2. That he had his skull broken—vengeance aimed at that guilty head which had worn the usurped crown: 3. That the stone was cast upon him by a woman. See first his foolish pride in laying so much to heart this little circumstance of his disgrace. There was no care about his precious soul; no prayer to God for his mercy; but *very solicitous he is to patch up his shattered credit, when there is no patching his shattered skull!*" These extracts require no comment, and they are any thing but dignified, or in unison with the subject of them, and indicate a levity, though perhaps not intended, which is highly objectionable.

ABIRAM was a seditious Levite, who confederated with Korah and Dathan against Moses and Aaron, and who shared their awful fate in the wilderness at the encampment of Kadesh-Barnea, B.C. 1489.

ABISHAG, a young and beautiful

Shunammite virgin, who was chosen to attend and *warm* or *heat*, as it is rendered in the Scriptures, King David in his old age. Josephus thus relates the incident:—"This king being oppressed with the weight of years, his body was so benumbed that, though ever so many bed-clothes were laid upon him, he could not get any warmth. His physicians were consulted, and they unanimously recommended that the most beautiful virgin in all the country should be sought for, and put into the king's bed to cherish and warm him."—"The king," writes a modern author, "consented to the proposal, first observing the several precautions which his prudence and religion suggested. All Israel was searched for a proper person, and the choice fell on a Shunammite, Abishag by name, a young, beautiful, and virtuous woman. He made her his wife, and she was with him both night and day; but though he had married her, they always lived together in a state of continence. Thus assisted, the infirm monarch continued to live, but was not capable to act in person, nor even went out of the palace." Mr Henry gives us his opinion on the affair:—"They ordered him (David) a young bed-fellow. A foolish project it was to prescribe nuptials to one that should have been preparing for his funeral, but they knew what would gratify their own corruptions, and perhaps were too willing to gratify him under colour of consulting his health. His prophets should have been consulted as well as his physicians in an affair of this nature." It does not appear that the transaction merits this uncharitable interpretation. It was in accordance with the habits and customs of the country, and the inspired historian relates it in a very simple and interesting manner. The afflictions, labours, fatigues, and perpetual wars of David had exhausted his bodily strength, now—to adopt his own beautiful observation of the "days of the years of the life of man—threescore and ten years of age," yet his mind was vigorous, his faculties were entire, and as he continued to govern his

kingdom with wisdom and authority, the preservation of his life was humanly speaking of the greatest importance. Besides, the admission of Abishag's marriage to the king completely obviates any censure. Adonijah, one of David's sons, afterwards wished to marry her at his father's death, and engaged Bathsheba, Solomon's mother, to use her interest with that prince in his behalf; but the request greatly irritated Solomon, who, knowing the motives which induced him to prefer it, ordered him for political reasons to be put to death.

ABISHAI, the brother of Joab, is classed among the most distinguished warriors of David's reign. He always continued devoted to the interests of that prince, for whom his zeal was such that he would have taken summary vengeance on Shimei for his insulting conduct, and would have killed Saul, if he had not been prevented by David, who shrank with horror at the very idea of becoming a regicide, and slaying "the Lord's anointed." Abishai was restrained with difficulty, but he carried off a lance and a vessel of water, which were at the head of Saul as he lay sleeping, and returned unperceived by any of the officers or soldiers, who never awoke, so that there was not the least suspicion of what had been done in the king's tent. The inspired historian notices some of Abishai's heroic actions. It appears that he slew three hundred men with his own spear, and he was present, and greatly distinguished himself, in the combat fought with the adherents of Ishbosheth. He also caused a great slaughter among the Syrians (improperly called Idumeans in our version), and compelled them to become tributaries. In a battle fought against the Philistines he slew a giant named Ishbi-benob, the iron of whose spear weighed three hundred shekels, and who was girded with a new sword, with which he intended to kill David.

ABNER, the son of Ner, was Saul's father-in-law and the leader of his armies. He remained firmly attached to Saul through all his disastrous fortunes, and

after his melancholy death, proclaimed his son Ishbosheth his successor. As the great majority of the Hebrews still adhered to Saul's family, Ishbosheth enjoyed the royal dignity two years without much molestation, but at the end of that period a civil war commenced between the united tribes and the tribe of Judah, which had proclaimed David king. Abner marched against David with a powerful and well disciplined army, and a battle ensued, in which he sustained a complete defeat. A quarrel shortly afterwards arose between him and Ishbosheth, occasioned by the latter alleging that Abner had seduced one of his father Saul's concubines, and he went over to David, whose wife Michal he caused to be restored to him. The pretensions of Ishbosheth were soon annihilated by this defection, as he had all along depended on his general's valour and prudence. Abner assembled the principal officers of his army and the elders of Israel, to whom he represented that since God had caused David to be anointed king, it was altogether useless to offer any resistance to the Divine will. This induced them to proffer their allegiance to David, to whom Abner immediately went, and by whom he was received in the kindest manner. Thus far he had negotiated the revolt from Ishbosheth, but he was not permitted to see it accomplished. Joab, the general of David's army, jealous of the high military reputation of this new leader, and afraid that he might dispossess him in the command of the army, followed Abner as he was returning from the interview with David to assemble the people and elect that prince to the throne, and drawing him aside to a private place, under the pretence of holding a friendly conversation with him, he treacherously inflicted on him a mortal wound. When David was informed of this execrable deed he expressed his utmost detestation of it, protested before God that it was done without his knowledge, and uttered imprecations against Joab and all his house. "I and my kingdom," he declared, "are guiltless before the Lord

for ever of the blood of Abner, the son of Ner. Let it rest on the head of Joab, and on all his father's house, and let there not fail from the house of Joab one that hath an issue, or that is a leper, or that leaneth on a staff [a cripple], or that falleth on the sword [that dieth a violent death], or that lacketh bread." He ordered Abner to be publicly interred in a solemn manner, following the corpse in person, in the city of Hebron, where he erected a monument to his memory, on which was placed an epitaph in his praise written by the King himself. Some commentators have inferred that the 139th Psalm was composed by David on this occasion.

The fate of Abner, basely assassinated by Joab, has numerous parallels in the world, and is one of the many proofs on record that ambitious men of bad principles will scruple at nothing to gratify their passions, or to rid themselves of real or imaginary rivals. Joab acted in the most infamous and ungenerous manner; for, instead of meeting his supposed rival openly and honourably, he employed the most soothing language, and coolly murdered him while making the greatest pretensions of friendship. But the conduct of David, also, ought not to be overlooked, and in it we have one of the multifarious instances of the infirmity of human nature. It is true that he expressed in the strongest language his detestation of the crime, but he ought to have brought Joab to justice, and inflicted on him a suitable punishment. He was not then indeed firmly seated on the throne, and as Joab was powerful, he probably did not dare to proceed against him; yet, relying as he ought to have done on those Divine promises which had been signally verified in his own experience, it was his duty to have called him to account for the crime at a suitable opportunity. Instead of adopting such a procedure, Joab was allowed to commit other crimes, until the commencement of the reign of Solomon, who, in obedience to his father's injunctions, executed retributive justice upon him for all

his enormities, which David, it would appear, was afraid to attempt, though Joab by his conduct had long increased that king's aversion to him.

ABRAHAM, originally called **ABRAM**, one of the most illustrious personages in sacred or profane history, distinguished by the titles of *Father of the Faithful*, and the *Friend of God*, was the celebrated ancestor of the Jewish nation, though not called by his name. The particulars of his life as given by Moses first claim our attention, before noticing what tradition records of him, and what other writers have added or supplied.

Abraham was the tenth in lineal descent from Noah by his second son Shem, and was born, according to the Hebrew chronology, B. C. 1996, upwards of three hundred and fifty years after the general Deluge. His father's name was Terah, of whom Moses gives us no particulars; but from an intimation in the Book of Joshua, it appears that the descendants of Shem had early become infected with idolatry—"Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old times, even Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor, and they served other gods," Josh. xxiv. 2, 14. As his early years were spent with his father, it is probable that Abraham would be instructed in the same religious practices, but we are nowhere informed of the nature of the idolatry followed in those early times. The city of Ur, called "Ur of the Chaldees," was the birth-place of the Patriarch, and it was from this place that God first directed him into the Land of Promise. We have no particulars of the manner in which Jehovah selected this remarkable personage to fulfil the arrangements of Divine Providence—of his renouncing the idolatrous practices, such as they were, which then prevailed, or of the previous years of his life; and he is introduced rather abruptly by the sacred historian after he had been married to Sarah, and when he was evidently a man of considerable wealth according to the estimation of those early times. In the twelfth chapter of the Book of

Genesis, after the relation of the tower of Babel, the confusion of language, and the dispersion of mankind, Moses gives us a list of the generations of Shem to Terah, who, besides Abraham, had two other sons, Nahor and Haran, the last of whom was the father of Lot, and died before Terah in his native country. We are next informed of the marriages of Abraham and Nahor; and the whole concludes with the emigration of Terah and his household from Ur of the Chaldees to proceed to the country of Canaan, the future inheritance of Abraham's descendants. During this emigration they came to Haran, or Charan, in Mesopotamia, where they appear to have resided for some time, and here Terah died in the 205th year of his age.

Whatever may have been the nature of the Divine communication made to Abraham previous to the commencement of this emigration, or whatever the ostensible cause of it—which some have supposed to be the prevalence of idolatry throughout Chaldea—he was summoned to fulfil the command of Jehovah—to leave his "country, kindred, and his father's house," and the promise was given him—"I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Now, these announcements were made when Abraham was at least seventy-five years old, which was his age when he departed from Haran in his progress towards Canaan, and his wife Sarah was barren, nor was there any immediate prospect that the "great nation" of which he was to be the ancestor, was to be composed exclusively of his own descendants. Yet, confiding in the truth of the Divine promises, though he probably did not comprehend their import or meaning, he fulfilled with alacrity the orders of Omnipotence, thus affording a remarkable illustration of that faith which one of his descendants—the great Apostle of the Gentiles—defines to be

the "substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and which he explains to the Hebrews in this conclusive manner—"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, *not knowing whither he went.*"

Accompanied by Lot, and at the head of his household, the Patriarch entered the country to which he had been guided by Divine wisdom, and halted in the valley of Sichem or Shechem, in after times in the cantonment allotted to Ephraim. In the time of Abraham the city of Shechem was not built, and Moses therefore mentions it by anticipation. The country was at that early period inhabited by the Canaanites—not the ancestors of that race afterwards destroyed or expelled by Joshua, who were evidently interlopers, and of the same Eastern origin as the *Pali*, or the Egyptian kings of that newly introduced dynasty which "knew not Joseph"—but a more ancient people, whose language, customs, and manners, were almost the same as those of Mesopotamia, for we find that in whatever part of the country Abraham located he was easily understood, no interpreter appears to have been necessary, and his appearance among them excited no surprise. When Abraham, therefore, was in Canaan among the old inhabitants, he was among his own relatives. They were not indeed of his own family, but they were of the same posterity as himself—a race of Shemite Canaanites, who had spread themselves over the country before their subjugation by the descendants of Ham, who also took possession of Egypt. This view suggests to us a very important historical fact, which may serve to illustrate a subject on which many opinions have prevailed. It is certain that the Patriarch Shem was alive at the time when Abraham was called, and if we are disposed to identify him as Melchisedek, king of Salem, or *of peace*, which has received the decided support of several learned interpreters, when that personage visited

Canaan he visited his own posterity, by whom he would be doubtless held in the highest honour as "king of justice," and priest of the Most High God.

Abraham pitched his tent in the "Plain of Moreh," which doubtless indicates a place in the Vale of Sichem, but the word (*ailon*) rendered *plain* in this and some passages is in other places translated *oak*, which is generally considered to denote the terebinth or turpentine tree, which stands at the head of a numerous family of trees, most of which are noted for their fragrant resins. In conformity with the state of society in those times, when there were few or no cities in the country, the place where the Patriarch first located was distinguished either by a grove of trees, or by some tree of remarkable size and appearance, the branches of which were large, diffusive, and convenient for affording shelter to a pastoral encampment, and indeed the *tree* of Moreh is alluded to in several other places, Gen. xxxv. 4, 8; Josh. xxiv. 26; Judges ix. 6. Here the promises made to Abraham were renewed, and he was again assured that his posterity would inherit the country in which he then sojourned. He soon afterwards removed to a mountain on the east of Beth-el, where he pitched his tent west of Beth-el and east of the city of Ai, which the Israelites took in Joshua's time, both of which towns are here also mentioned by anticipation, especially Beth-el, which was first so called by Jacob on his journey from Beersheba to Haran, its previous name having been Luz. It does not, however, appear that any town was ever built on the precise spot to which Jacob gave this name, but rather that the appellation was afterwards transferred to the adjacent town of Luz, which thus became the historical Beth-el.

A severe famine visited Canaan some time after Abraham's settlement in it, and he was compelled to retire into Egypt, at that early period populous, fertile, and flourishing. Its monarchy was founded, but whether its kings were in those times distinguished by their peculiar royal

appellation of *Pharaoh*, which Moses gives to the reigning sovereign, is not so evident. The beauty of Sarah made him fearful that the Egyptian ruler would kill him if he acknowledged her as his wife, and he counselled her to give out that she was his sister, which he thought would be sufficient to protect him from any jealous or covetous resentment. This was the truth in one sense, for she was his step-sister, or the daughter of his father by another wife, but it was a moral untruth, because it was evidently intended to convey the impression that Sarah was literally his sister, and connected with him by no other relationship. For this conduct the Patriarch has been censured by some writers, while he has been ingeniously and plausibly defended by others, but it is unnecessary to enter at present into the nice distinctions and suppositions on this incident.

The anticipations of Abraham were well founded. A report of Sarah's beauty soon reached Pharaoh, and she was taken into the harem of his palace. It is not likely that the Patriarch was a consenting party in this transaction, though, as the result proved, he might have averted it if he had boldly stated his real relationship; and yet there is no intimation that Pharaoh was considered to act, or intended to act, oppressively in taking away a man's sister without obtaining his consent. It is a privilege still practised in various Oriental countries by royal personages to claim for their harem the unmarried sister or daughter of any of their subjects; and it is an exercise of authority which, however repugnant it may be to the father or the brother, is never questioned or resisted. It may be, and it doubtless often is, regretted as a misfortune that such relatives should have attracted the royal notice, but after it has happened the right is unhesitatingly admitted. In the case of Abimelech, king of Gerar, who also took away Sarah from her supposed brother, it is expressly stated that he did so "in the integrity of his heart and innocency of his hands," which allows his right to act

as he did if Sarah had been no other to Abraham than his sister. Meanwhile Pharaoh, to show his honourable intentions towards Sarah, behaved in a most munificent manner to Abraham on her account. He bestowed on him "sheep, and oxen, and he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels," these male and female servants becoming of course his property as slaves, and members of his household.

But Sarah was rescued by Divine interposition from the attentions of the Egyptian monarch. Pharaoh "and his house were visited with great plagues because of Sarah." The nature of these plagues has caused some very idle and foolish speculations on the part of certain old commentators and traditionary writers, who have hazarded some most extraordinary assertions and conjectures on the subject. It has also been thought singular that a miraculous interference should have been necessary to convince Pharaoh, and afterwards Abimelech, of their criminality in detaining the wife of Abraham. But without referring to the peculiar situation of Sarah as the future ancestress of the chosen people, and therefore under the special guidance of Omnipotence, whose purposes and arrangements in this respect are fully developed in the Mosaic history, it is simply necessary to state that any attempt on the part of Abraham to procure her release by proper application and request would most probably have been fruitless, and might indeed have been attended with personal danger to both parties. Whenever a woman has attracted the royal notice, and is taken into the harem of an Oriental monarch, she becomes altogether secluded, without the possibility of coming out, at least during the life of the reigning sovereign. Communications with the women of the seraglio can only be obtained by means of the eunuchs or keepers, and perhaps never when any suspicions occur to the guards who are entrusted with the charge of them, otherwise instant death would be the fate of all concerned. The following incident

completely illustrates these observations. In one of the campaigns of the Czar Peter of Russia against the Turks, after the fatal battle of Pruth, an officer in the Russian service, whose wife and daughter, both beautiful women, were with him, had the misfortune of losing them by the breaking of one of their coach-wheels. They were seized and carried off by the Tartars, who were pressing on the retreating Russians. The officer, who held the rank of colonel in Peter's army, suspecting whither his wife and daughter had been conveyed, applied to the Grand Vizier, who ordered a strict inquiry to be made, but without effect. "The colonel," says the writer who narrates the story, "being afterwards informed that they were both carried to Constantinople and presented to the Grand Seignior, obtained a passport and went thither in search of them. Getting acquainted with a Jew doctor, who was physician to the seraglio, the doctor told him that two such ladies as he described had lately been presented to the Sultan, but that *when any of the sex were once taken into the seraglio, they were never suffered to quit it more.* The colonel, however, tried every expedient he could devise to recover his wife, if he could not obtain both, until, becoming outrageous by repeated disappointments, they shut him up in a dungeon, and it was with much difficulty he got released by the intercession of some of the ambassadors at that court. He was afterwards told by the same doctor that both the ladies had died of the plague, and with this information he was obliged to content himself and return home."

The Egyptian king no longer attempted to detain Sarah. Whatever was the nature of the plagues or the manner in which he received his information, he summoned Abraham before him, and severely remonstrated with him for the partial statement he had given of his relationship. He informed the Patriarch that he had intended to make her his wife, but as he had now discovered that she was married to him, he honourably

resigned her to him as her own husband, and dismissed them. We are told that "Pharaoh commanded his men concerning him, and they sent him away, and his wife, and all that he had." This looks like an order to leave the country—an injunction with which the Patriarch felt it prudent, and was indeed willing to comply.

Abraham's residence in Egypt had greatly increased his substance and his household. It is said of him that he was not only "very rich in cattle," but "in silver and gold"—probably vessels and massive pieces of these metals. His return to Canaan, and to his former settlement near Beth-el, now resembled the progress of a pastoral prince rich in cattle, camels, and other beasts of burden, while his domestics formed a very numerous retinue. We can almost fancy the "Father of the Faithful," at this interesting period of his career, once more in the country promised to his descendants after the danger he had escaped in Egypt, with Sarah, the faithful companion of all his journeyings, to whom he was always most tenderly attached. The regard he evinced toward his wife is indeed conspicuous throughout his whole history, and we may almost ascribe his subterfuge in Egypt and afterwards in Gerar to a tender solicitude for her safety and welfare as well as for his own. His nephew Lot, who had accompanied him into Egypt, returned with him, and he also had acquired very extensive additions to his substance, over which he had always retained his own personal control. The circumstances in which they were now placed rendered it necessary that there should be a separation between them for the sake of the pasturage of their cattle, and, moreover, it was no part of the Divine purpose that Lot should ever amalgamate himself with Abraham, notwithstanding their near relationship. The separation was accelerated by a strife which took place between the herdsmen of the respective parties, the cause of which is not mentioned, but it appears from the narrative that the flocks and

herds of the uncle and nephew were so near, that mutual encroachments took place either upon the good pasture grounds, or upon the wells of water, and probably upon both, as quarrels about water are particularly mentioned in the time of Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 20. Quarrels from both causes still occur among the Arab tribes, although the pasture boundaries and the property of wells are in general carefully defined. The strife between Abraham's herdsmen and those of his nephew was so serious as to cause the interference of the Patriarch. He deprecated to Lot any cause of quarrel, reminded him of their relationship, and strenuously urged him to proceed into the adjacent country. "Is not the whole land," he asked, "before thee? Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me. If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will take the right, or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." The disinterested conduct of Abraham on this occasion deserves the greatest commendation. He conceded the privilege of selection which of right was his own as Lot's senior, and its practical importance is evident. Lot readily coincided with the proposal, the necessity of which he doubtless saw was inevitable, and beholding "the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord," he journeyed eastward, and located himself near Sodom, leaving his uncle in Canaan. The Patriarch was honoured by a renewal of the promises in favour of his descendants, and shortly afterwards he removed his tents, and pitched them near Kirjath-Arba, afterwards called Hebron, and located himself in the *plain*, which means under the shelter of the turpentine tree of one Mamre, a friendly Amorite.

At that period the adjacent districts or regions were governed by a number of petty kings or chiefs, whose states are enumerated by the sacred historian, and afford us an interesting glance of ancient geography. Amraphel, king of Shinar,

Arioch, king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and Tidal, king of Nations, are the names of the kings who commenced a war with the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Adnah, Zebaiim, and Bela, all of which cities, with the exception of Bela, were afterwards destroyed for their detestable enormities, and covered by the waters of the Dead Sea. Shinar, in its proper acceptation, denotes a territory between the Euphrates and Tigris. Elam is an ancient name of Persia beyond the Tigris. Ellasar is placed by some in Arabia, and by others in Assyria, but the situation of Tidal's kingdom from his indeterminate title of "king of nations," is unknown. The five Cities of the Plain were each independent, and ruled by their own chiefs, who were masters of a small territory surrounding the cities. It is evident, however, that the four kings, the chief of whom was Chedorlaomer, were no greater than their antagonists, namely, petty chiefs of a town and surrounding district. This supposition is confirmed by the smallness of the force under Abraham, by which they were afterwards defeated. It appears that the kings of the five cities had been rendered tributary to Chedorlaomer, and had continued so twelve years, but they rebelled in the thirteenth, which was the occasion of the confederated hostilities. The nature of this earliest account on record of an act of warfare, is illustrated by a reference to existing practices among the Arab tribes, on the supposition, which is most probable, that the confederated kings who attacked the kings of the Plain were of no great dignity than nomade chiefs or sheikhs, inhabiting the country between Canaan and the Euphrates, and some of them perhaps beyond that river. A careful examination of the inspired text, in fact, almost proves that the expedition was what would now be called an Arab incursion. They sweep with rapidity over the territories mentioned—they successfully attack the Rephaim, the Zuzim, and the Emim, people of extraordinary stature, inhabiting the country east of Jordan and the Dead Sea, and the ancient

Horites in Arabia Petræa, in the vicinity of that lake, apparently overrunning the eastern bank of the Jordan from near its source to the desert south of Canaan, through which they proceed west towards the Mediterranean, and after a near approach to that Sea, at their return with captives and spoil through the Valley of the Jordan, give battle to the five kings of the Plain. But it is evident that the forces of the confederated kings were not numerous, from the circumstance that the kings of the Plain did not hesitate to give them battle on their return flushed with success. Travellers familiar with the regions indicated inform us that there are few shiekhs of the present time who can bring more than three hundred horsemen into action; and if we suppose that each of the four *kings* brought such a number of lightly armed men, we may arrive at a safe estimate of their numbers. It is a common circumstance, even at present, for Arabs and Turcomans in much smaller numbers to traverse extensive deserts with extraordinary rapidity, scour the country beyond these, sack villages, threaten even large towns during the night, and return enriched with spoils and booty.

The scene of action between the contending shiekhs was the Plain of Siddim in the immediate vicinity of Sodom, to which Lot had retired when he separated from his uncle. There is here some discrepancy in the inspired narrative, as we are told that the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah "fled and fell there;" and yet the king of Sodom is prominently introduced immediately afterwards. It is evidently indicated that the kings of the Plain were defeated, and their goods and provisions carried off, while the inhabitants of their cities had fled to the neighbouring mountains—a practice still followed by the people of the East in times of danger and alarm, who also carefully send all their valuable property, such as it is, to these fastnesses. The wealth of Lot, a recent settler in the Plain, who had also enriched himself by his residence in Egypt, was too powerful a temptation to

those predatory chiefs; and accordingly, after defeating and pillaging the five kings, they seized him and all his property, and carried him with them to their own headquarters. Lot appears to have been in no condition to resist, and consequently became an easy prey to the confederated victors.

An escaped prisoner found his way to Abraham, still dwelling under the tree of Mamre the friendly Amorite, who, with his brothers Eshcol and Aner, was the ally of the Patriarch. Lot is here designated Abraham's *brother*, in conformity with a usage, of which there are frequent instances in the Scriptures, common among the Hebrews, who did not confine the term to brothers, literally so called, but extended it to all near relations. The Patriarch armed his *servants*, or whom we would call slaves, to the number of three hundred and eighteen, and by rapid night marches overtook the predatory chiefs at Dan near the springs of the Jordan, and defeated them in an easy action, in which the confederated kings themselves appear to have been slain. Lot and his household were rescued, and all the property of which he had been plundered was recovered. The result of this transaction indicates the relative position of Abraham in Canaan at this period. It is obvious that as he had among the slaves "born in his house" three hundred and eighteen men fit to bear arms, exclusive of purchased slaves, old persons, women, and children, he must have been regarded as a powerful chief by the petty princes among whom he dwelt. This is subsequently intimated by the address of the Children of Heth, who said to him, "My lord, thou art a mighty prince among us."

We have no minute particulars of this earliest recorded battle, or of Abraham's pursuit of the victors. He is said to have "divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night," which indicates that a simultaneous rush was made upon the forces of the confederated kings from different quarters—a favourite mode of warfare and surprise, strictly in ac

cordance with Arab usages. Some tribes indeed are said to consider it cowardly and disgraceful to make an attack on a camp by night, but others are not so scrupulous, and when the attack is concerted, the assailants arrange their march in such a manner that they may fall upon the camp an hour before the first dawn, when they are likely to find the objects of their attack fast asleep. Various plans are adopted on these occasions to ensure success, in which the assailants are greatly facilitated by the neglect of posting night-watches and sentinels. It is remarkable that few persons are killed on either side in these Arab encounters. Burckhardt informs us that when fifteen or sixteen men are killed in a skirmish, the circumstance is remembered as an event of great importance for many years by both parties.

When Abraham returned from the pursuit of the confederated kings and the rescue of Lot, he was met by the King of Sodom in what is called the *Valley of Shaveh*, supposed to be the same as the Valley of Jehoshaphat, mentioned by the Prophet Joel (iii. 2, 12). The Patriarch was attended by his armed domestics with their prisoners and spoils, and the King of Sodom claimed the former as his portion, conceding the latter to the captor. According to the usages of both the ancient and the present Orientals, Abraham had an undoubted right to the goods and cattle, and the King of Sodom, therefore, is entitled to less applause for his generosity than what is apparently his due. The custom, we are informed, is to this effect—that if an enemy has spoiled an Arab camp, and carried off some prisoners, and if the whole be afterwards recovered by another party—those prisoners are restored, but the property belongs to those by whom it was recaptured. Abraham, however, declined to receive his due, and relinquished his right to his friends, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, who had accompanied him. “I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord”—(a Hebraism indicating, *I have sworn*)—“the Most High God, the Possessor of

heaven and earth, that I will not take from a thread even to a shoe (sandal) latchet”—a proverbial expression of diminution—“and that I will not take any thing that is thine, lest thou shouldst say, I have made Abram rich.”

But on the return of Abraham from this expedition a more important personage met him, about whose identity there has been a great diversity of opinion. This was Melchizedek, king of Salem, who presented bread and wine to the Patriarch, and blessed him in the name of the Most High God, and to whom he gave tithes of all the spoils he had taken from the enemy, thus recognizing his priestly office. Who Melchizedek was is no where stated, and the Scriptures are silent respecting him, except where the Psalmist, referring to the Messiah, exclaims, “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” He is termed “priest of the Most High God,” and as such he was recognized by the Patriarch.

After these transactions Jehovah renewed his covenant with Abraham in a vision. This introduces us to some important events in his history. A promise had been repeatedly given to the Patriarch that his descendants, who were to be as the “dust of the earth,” were to inhabit Canaan as their destined inheritance, but as yet he had no children, nor, humanly speaking, could he expect any by Sarah. He accordingly intimated in the vision now alluded to his peculiar position—“Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus. Behold, to me thou hast given no seed, and one born in my house is mine heir.” It is remarkable that Abraham does not seem to have thought of his nephew Lot as his heir, but one of his house-born slaves. There was no degradation in preferring Eliezer to Lot, as the Patriarch was entitled to dispose of his substance as he pleased. The term *slave* in Mahometan Asia is rarely attended with the condition which is usually associated with the word, and it is

neither regarded as opprobrious, nor does it convey any idea of degradation. On the contrary, slaves are generally treated with such kindness and favour that they become devoted to the interests of their masters. They have often great influence in their families, they neither cultivate the fields nor work in manufactories, and their employment is for the most part of a light and domestic nature. This is particularly the case with those who, like Eliezer of Damascus, are "born in the house" or family. They are objects of peculiar care, most attached to their master, often inherit a large share of his wealth; and it is frequently the practice of persons who have no children to adopt a favourite slave of this class as their own child and heir. This sufficiently explains the statement of the Patriarch, who had destined his faithful steward Eliezer to be his principal heir.

But a Divine communication assured Abraham that Eliezer was not to be his heir, and that his own direct offspring were to fulfil the gracious purposes of Omnipotence in future ages. On this occasion the promises were renewed in a more definite and decisive manner—the residence of his descendants in Egypt was intimated, the tyranny they were to encounter, the punishment of their oppressors, their return to Canaan, and their expulsion of the Canaanite idolaters. The Patriarch listened in silent confidence—"he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness," Gen. xv. 6.

Abraham had been ten years in Canaan after his return from Egypt when Sarah, who firmly believed that she was now past becoming a mother, advised him to take her "handmaid Hagar, that she might obtain children by her." Hagar was a female slave, and as she was an Egyptian, it may be concluded that she was one of those maid-servants whom Abraham had brought with him from that country. We are told that Sarah gave Hagar to him "to be his wife," and in this she exercised a peculiar right, still prevalent in the East, where the female slaves among the Jews are, as they

always have been, solely under the control of the mistress of the family. The word translated *wife* in this place, and in other passages rendered *concubine*, describes a wife of a second or inferior class. Polygamy was permitted among the Hebrews in their pastoral state after the time of Abraham, but in all such cases as the present, though such women were considered wives, and the connection legal and customary, the absence of certain solemnities and contracts marked the condition as inferior. The children did not inherit the property of their father, who, if he had sons by his principal wife or wives, usually provided for the others in his lifetime. Nevertheless, the condition of such a slave was not altered by the manner in which she lived in the family of her master, and this state of affairs is still the same in Oriental countries. Hagar remained a *bondswoman* or *slave* even after she had become the mother of Ishmael, and Sarah is still called her *mistress*. In the incident which follows we still perceive that she was under the sole control of Sarah. The conduct of Hagar, probably elated by the condition in which she felt herself as being pregnant, irritated Sarah, and induced her to complain to Abraham. He replied that her maid was her own property, and that she could deal with her as she pleased. As there was no appeal, the treatment which Hagar experienced from the indignant Sarah, who on this occasion exhibited the resentment of an insulted wife, so completely broke her spirit, that she chose rather to encounter the miseries of the Wilderness than submit longer to her mistress. She accordingly fled, and from the direction she took, which was the common caravan road between Palestine and Egypt through the Desert of Shur to the west of Arabia Petræa, it is evident that it was her intention to return to her native country of Egypt. But she was stopped in her progress by a mysterious messenger—one of these superior intelligences to whom the term *angel* is restricted. She was exhorted to

return and submit herself to her mistress—the birth of a son was announced to her, and his remarkable descendants were described. From the sequel we are informed that Hagar obeyed the directions of the angel, and returned to Abraham's household, where her son Ishmael was born when Abraham was eighty-six years of age.

Thirteen years after the birth of Ishmael, when the Patriarch was in his ninety-ninth year, Jehovah renewed his promises to him in a manner which could not be misunderstood. On this occasion we are told that Abraham "fell on his face," and "God talked with him," namely, he placed himself in a posture still known in the East, expressive of the deepest humility and profound adoration, the body resting on the hands and knees, while the head is bent down, the forehead touching the ground—a posture still used by the Mahometans in their worship. It was now that the Patriarch received a full explanation of the Divine promises. Jehovah significantly changed his name from *Abram, exalted father*, to *Abraham*, the abbreviation of three Hebrew words, *ab rab hamon*, signifying the *father of a great multitude*. The original name of his wife, which was *Sarai*, meaning *my princess*, was also changed to *Sarah, the princess*, that is, *of many*, no longer confined to one. On this occasion the birth of a son by Sarah was announced, his name *Isaac* was intimated, and the promises were to be confined to his descendants, while the Patriarch was also assured that Ishmael would be blessed in proportion, and that he would be the father of a great nation. The astonished and overjoyed Patriarch could only exclaim in wonder and gratitude, "Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?"

It was, moreover, on this occasion that the rite of circumcision—the remarkable type of the sacrament of baptism—was commanded, which was re-enforced by the Law of Moses, and has been carefully observed by all Jews throughout the

world to the present time. This rite was to be solemnized eight days after birth, and not only were the male infants of Hebrew parents to be circumcised, but those of their slaves, either born in their families or purchased from strangers. In reference to this rite it is impossible to ascertain whether it existed in the world previous to the Divine command. Herodotus mentions circumcision as a custom ancient even in his time, and existing in several nations, particularly among the Egyptians and Ethiopians, and this circumstance has induced some to argue that the Jews adopted it from the Egyptians. They maintain that the Egyptians, who seem to have practised the rite in the earliest times, and who were entirely unconnected with the race of Abraham, were not likely to borrow it from the Hebrews, whom they hated on account of their pastoral avocations, and therefore that no new rite was enjoined to Abraham, but it was simply made a sign or covenant, which it was not with other nations. But it does not appear that circumcision was ever general among the Egyptians, and there is every evidence that it was confined to the priesthood and particular professions. Bochart and others think that the Egyptians received it from the Arabians, who practised circumcision, deriving it from Ishmael; but even among them it does not appear to have been considered essential or obligatory until it was peremptorily enforced by Mahomet, and in all the Moslem countries it is as rigidly practised as it is among the Jews. It is now ascertained, however, that circumcision was not confined exclusively to the Oriental nations. The Spaniards found something approximating to it prevalent in Mexico; it has been traced in the Australian continent and islands, and also in some of the islands of the Pacific Ocean. Whence those remote people could have learned a rite which, there is every reason to believe, was instituted solely to distinguish a particular nation under a preparatory and temporary dispensation, it would occupy too much

space to inquire, and we cannot enter on it here. The Jews, it is well known, perform the rite of circumcision on their infants when eight days old, in obedience to the Divine injunction to Abraham, but if the child is then unable to bear the operation it may be deferred. As Ishmael, however, was thirteen years old when he was circumcised, the Mahometans usually defer it to that age. It may be done either in the synagogue or at home, and even in the Mosaic Law no particular directions are given as to the operator. The father may do it if he pleases, and we have one instance of it being performed by a mother, Exod. iv. 25.

The Patriarch was still resident under the protecting branches of the grove, or wide-spreading trees on the property of Mamre, when shortly afterwards he descried three persons, apparently strangers, walking towards him while he was reclining at the door of his tent during the heat of the day, namely, in the afternoon, when travellers in the East usually seek for places of refreshment and repose. He ran to meet them—an action which denoted the highest degree of respect, and bowed himself to the ground to acknowledge the presence of superiors—this ceremony consisting in bowing so as to bring the upper part of the body at right angles with the lower, the hands resting on the knees, and the legs somewhat asunder. Ignorant as to who they were, he nevertheless invited them courteously into his tent, and entreated them to partake of his hospitality. The strangers complied, and while the repast was in preparation water was brought to wash their feet—a necessary and most agreeable part of hospitality in the East, which is usually performed to travellers by domestics. In those countries, we are told, where the people wear sandals, which only protect the soles of the feet, and cannot prevent them from becoming foul and parched, the bathing of the feet and ankles is peculiarly agreeable and refreshing, and the washing of them after a journey is indeed indispensably necessary.

But in the deserts of Arabia and the neighbouring countries, no covering of the feet can prevent the necessity of this duty, because the sand or dust penetrates every thing, and produces an itching and feverish irritation with the natural perspiration peculiarly disagreeable.

While the strangers were thus superintended by Abraham's domestics he proceeded to the tent of Sarah, and told her to take a quantity of fine meal, to knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth, while he proceeded to his flocks, and selected a young calf, which he ordered to be dressed—a noble entertainment in those countries, and “he took butter and milk, and the calf which he had dressed, and set it before them, and he stood by them under the tree;” namely, he waited upon them in person, and attended to their wants. Here it is necessary to offer some illustrative observations. At first sight, and to those unacquainted with the Oriental usages of the present day, it appears strange that in such an establishment as that of Abraham there was no bread ready baked for the strangers. It is, however, to be observed, that in the East, where there are no bakers by trade, except in large towns, no more bread is baked than is actually required for the daily consumpt of the family, as it will not keep longer than one day in those climates, and as the people always prefer new to stale bread. In the villages and in camps families bake their own bread, and this is done by the women in a very short time, by kneading the dough into round or oblong cakes of thin and soft bread. The process of making “cakes upon the hearth” seems to be various. Some think that the hearth indicates *hot embers* or *hot stones*, and others suppose that they were laid upon the hearth and covered with hot embers. Rauwolf informs us that he witnessed this process in the region which lies between the ancient Mesopotamia and Media. A woman, he says, presently made them cakes, about a finger thick, and the size of a trencher, which she first laid upon hot stones, and turned them often; and then

threw ashes and embers over them, and he acknowledges that the cakes so baked were very good and palatable. This process is used by the Arabs for their daily meal. There are other processes which are adopted in proportion to the thickness of the bread, but they are all intimately connected with each other. The rapidity with which the calf was killed and cooked on this occasion apparently indicates no less the want of preparation, for the meat had not only to be killed, but also dressed. It would occupy too much space in this illustrative digression, to enter into a minute description of the customs of both the ancient and modern Orientals on this subject, but it may be sufficient to observe that they consume only a very small quantity of animal food, and the Arabs even less, nor is meat ready killed often found except in large towns. The common food of the pastoral or nomade Arab tribes consists of flour baked into a paste and boiled with camel's milk, and this is the ordinary food even of the richest sheiks. They never indulge in animal food except on the occasion of a great festival, or when a stranger arrives, and we may consequently infer from analogy, that when the three strangers arrived at Abraham's encampment there was probably no food in it of any kind. Strangers, too, we are informed by Burckhardt, whose researches have done much to illustrate the Scriptures, are entertained in proportion to their rank. If the guest is an ordinary person, he is served with baked bread and the flour paste already mentioned; if he is of some *little* consequence, he is treated with coffee, rice, or flour, boiled with camel's milk, or baked paste kneaded up thoroughly with butter; if he is a person of rank, a kid or lamb is killed, the flesh is boiled with boiled wheat, which had been previously dried in the sun, and camel's milk, and the melted fat of the animal is put into a wooden bowl, and pressed down in the midst of the boiled wheat, and every morsel is dipped into this melted fat before it is swallowed. A bowl of camel's

milk is then frequently introduced. It is also very common to cut up the choice parts of the newly killed animal into small pieces, and broil them over the fire on skewers. This is resorted to in preparing a hasty repast for persons of distinction. The Orientals often serve up at their entertainments a lamb or kid which has been roasted or baked entire in a hole in the ground heated for the purpose, covered with stones; and this was a common construction of their ovens, which illustrates the manner in which the frogs got into the Egyptian ovens when the memorable plague of these reptiles was inflicted. It may seem strange to us that newly killed meat, even before the warmth of life has scarcely departed from it, should have been and still is eaten in the East, of which we have repeated instances in the Scriptures; and the only way to account for it is by assigning the heat of the climate, which prevents meat from being too long kept, and which may have introduced a custom in all seasons when the original cause does not immediately operate.

The three mysterious strangers having partaken of the Patriarch's hospitality, now asked for Sarah, and were informed by him that she was in her tent—the Oriental women having always their own peculiar apartments, whether in camps or houses. Abraham does not appear to have expressed any surprise that strangers should have known his wife by name. The conversation which followed relating to the birth of Isaac is given by the inspired historian (Gen. xviii. 9, 10), as are also the conduct and observations of Sarah, who overheard it. They then rose, and took their departure towards Sodom, on the way to which they were accompanied some distance by Abraham. Whether he discovered the condition of his mysterious guests does not appear, but what had passed hitherto did not demonstrate that they were celestial messengers. Some have supposed that he received certain intimations before they finally left him, but the conjectures are as various as they are fanciful and

speculative. He returned to his encampment at the close of the day, probably convinced that he had entertained the commissioned messengers of Jehovah. This seems to be the meaning of that passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews—“Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.”

The whole of this incident as narrated by Moses affords us some pleasing details of patriarchal manners. There must have been many tents for the accommodation of Abraham's numerous servants and dependants, while his flocks were probably at pasture some miles distant. As it is the duty of the Arab sheiks to entertain strangers, and as the latter must stop at the first tent they meet, the chief's tent is usually pitched in a direction to be the first at the point at which travellers commonly arrive. We find the Patriarch reclining at the door of his tent, like a modern Arab chief of dignity, to enjoy the comfortable and refreshing shade; at the sight of strangers he hastens to welcome them, he sets before them a generous and hospitable repast, and he attends personally to their wants. Sarah, though the wife of a powerful chief, thought it no degradation to be occupied in the household service of baking bread, and even at the present day among those in the East who, like Abraham, are “dwellers in tents,” the wife of the proudest chief usually superintends the preparation of bread, and even kneads and bakes it with her own hands. Other culinary duties still devolve upon the wives, even in families of the highest distinction. Dr Richardson mentions that when he was at Jerusalem he was consulted as a physician about the complaints of the ladies of a Turk of high rank, of whom he gives some interesting particulars, called Omar Effendi. “I was surprised to hear,” says he, “many of them [the ladies] ascribe their complaints to fatigue, which, I was informed, arose from their employment in the kitchen.”

The high testimony given to Abra-

ham's integrity by Jehovah, in the case of the intended destruction of the guilty Cities of the Plain, is appropriately introduced. The mysterious guests whom he had entertained went towards Sodom, where we subsequently find two of them concerned in the preservation of Lot, and Abraham was now informed that the detestable enormities of those cities demanded vengeance, and that their destruction was at hand. The intercession of the Patriarch in their favour, if fifty righteous persons were found within the cities, lest they might be destroyed with the wicked, is extremely affecting, as is the manner in which he acknowledges his own unworthiness in the Divine Presence as he continues to limit the number from forty-five, and so on in proportion, till he intercedes for the averting of the threatened judgment if only ten were found in Sodom. But, whatever may have been the extent of the population of those devoted cities, to which Sodom apparently constituted a capital, as being the most considerable, even ten righteous persons could not be found. With the exception of Bela they were all destroyed; the soil which their inhabitants had polluted even disappeared; the awful catastrophe which the Patriarch had attempted conditionally to avert, and which he probably witnessed, took place; Sodom, its dependencies, and their inhabitants, were overwhelmed by the fire of Heaven, and were for ever covered from human observation by the mysterious waters of the Dead Sea.

The Patriarch now struck his tents under the tree of Mamre, and collecting his domestics, his flocks, and his whole substance, proceeded towards the south, and entered the small Philistine state of Gerar, then governed by one of a succession of kings whose royal title was Abimelech. We are nowhere informed of the cause of this migration, and we may therefore presume that it was occasioned by some local necessity, such as the want of pasturage or water. The only remarkable incident connected with it is a repetition of the same deception

to Abimelech with respect to his relationship to Sarah which he had done to Pharaoh in Egypt, by simply representing her as his sister. It is likely that the same timidity influenced him, or he may have been persuaded that Sarah would be released in a manner as remarkable as she had been in Egypt. As there is a considerable similarity between this transaction and that which occurred in Egypt, it is unnecessary to dwell upon it in this place. It is curious that Abraham's marriage with his sister, after their real relationship was ascertained, appears to have been considered as nothing extraordinary either in Egypt or Gerar, and indeed in the former country, marriages between brothers and sisters were sanctioned by the laws long after the time of Abraham. The Orientals have never been very scrupulous in this particular, and it is said that the Persian kings sometimes married their own sisters and even their daughters. There is no instance in the history of the Patriarchs of a man marrying his full sister, and such marriages as that of Abraham and Sarah were afterwards forbidden by the Mosaic Law, but even that Law countenanced and rendered obligatory the marriage of a man with the widow of his deceased brother, for the purpose of retaining property in the same family or tribe.

At length the Divine promise was fulfilled to Abraham,—Sarah became a mother, and her only son Isaac was born when the Patriarch was in his hundredth year. The child grew, and on the occasion of his being weaned, when he was two or between two and three years of age, Abraham, we are told, held a great feast. It is worthy of notice that children are suckled in Oriental countries much longer than is customary in Europe, and we find several intimations of this fact in the Scriptures. In Persia male infants are often kept at the breast till they are three years of age, and never taken from it till upwards of two years, and the practice is nearly the same in all Asiatic countries; but every where a female child is weaned much sooner than

a male. Mr Morier tells us that when the Persian ambassador, Mirza Abul Hassan Khan, was in England, he concluded that it was on account of English children being early weaned that they were so superior in mental acquirements to those of his own country. "On the day the child is to be weaned," he adds, "they carry it to the mosque (in the manner, perhaps, that Hannah took Samuel to the house of the Lord when she weaned him), and after having performed certain acts of devotion, they return home, and collecting their friends and relations, they give a feast, of which they make the child also partaker."

The birth of Isaac made a considerable change in the Patriarch's household, which increased as he grew up, until it was found necessary to expatriate Ishmael and his mother. As Sarah had no confidence in the promise of a son which Abraham had received, she had probably, before Isaac was born, treated Ishmael as if he were her own son, and the hope of the Patriarch's house; but the feelings of the mother now supplanted her attachment to her adopted son by her slave. Ishmael, too, now about seventeen years of age, or older according to Calmet, and who, up to the age of fourteen, had been taught to consider himself as the sole heir of his father, was naturally dissatisfied at being superseded by his younger brother. He accordingly evinced a rudeness of conduct towards Isaac which irritated Sarah against him. St Paul, indeed, intimates that Ishmael persecuted or teased Isaac, which he might do more from a feeling of disappointed ambition than from any real dislike he entertained towards his younger brother. It may be here remarked, that the same usages still prevail in the East which are alluded to in the expatriation of Ishmael, and the son of a female slave would most certainly be superseded by the son of the wife or free woman afterwards born. In Persia, a country which affords numerous illustrations of the customs and manners noticed in the Scriptures, this principle is carried much farther. Not to

mention slaves, if a man has more than one wife, and he may have four, according to the Mahometan ritual, all equally his wives in the eye of the law, the son of the wife whose family and connections happen to be of greater distinction and rank than those of the other wives, often obtains the preference, and succeeds to his father's inheritance.

The proposal to expel Hagar and her son from the Patriarch's household came from Sarah, and Abraham listened to it with the greatest reluctance, for he appears to have cherished a sincere regard for Ishmael. Isaac was indeed the son of the promise, but many associations cherished his affection for Ishmael, and his repugnance to Sarah's entreaty. A Divine communication, however, reconciled him to the proposal, now rendered necessary to secure peace in his household. He was told that the expatriation of Ishmael was a necessary part of the Divine arrangements, and to entertain no fears for his welfare or that of his mother, who were under the special protection of Jehovah. Thus persuaded, he dismissed Hagar and Ishmael from his household, after providing them with suitable necessities for a journey across the Desert. The particulars of this transaction are not given by Moses, who merely mentions the affair in a general manner; but it is clear that the bitterness of feeling cherished by Sarah was not entertained by Abraham, who doubtless took leave of his son in a most affectionate manner, and who would comfort Hagar by the most consolatory hopes which the Divine communication he had received relative to Ishmael enabled him to cherish.

Abraham was still in the country of Gerar, in which we are informed he "sojourned many days." His wealth and prosperity had been marked by Abimelech, who perceived in him the special object of providential care. The king, whose entire conduct, as narrated by Moses, places him in the most favourable light, resolved to form a treaty with Abraham; and the account of it is the

more interesting, when we consider that it is the earliest instance on record of a treaty of peace, while, at the same time, its forms and terms indicate that even in those early ages such treaties had not been newly invented. Abimelech, attended by his chief minister Phichol, thus addressed the Patriarch—"Now, therefore, swear unto me here by God, that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, nor unto my son, nor with my son's son, but according to the kindness that I have done unto thee thou shalt do unto me, and to the land wherein thou hast sojourned." On this occasion Abraham expostulated with Abimelech on account of a well of water, dug by his own servants, of which he had been deprived by those of the latter, but the king solemnly assured him that he was utterly ignorant of the matter, and had not even heard of it till that moment. The treaty was then concluded, and Abraham secured himself in the property of the well by presenting seven ewe lambs to Abimelech, as an earnest that it had been dug by his servants. The place where this treaty was formed was called Beersheba, which means *the Well of the Oath*. In subsequent times a considerable town was built near it, which, as it was situated on the most southern extremity of the land of Israel, is often mentioned in the well known expression which occurs in the Sacred writings, *from Dan to Beersheba*.

The nature of the transaction here recorded—of the treaty between Abimelech and Abraham, will be more fully understood by a reference to existing customs of the Arabs of the present day. Abimelech asked Abraham to "swear unto him by God." Among the Arabs the name of God is indeed heard in every sentence they speak, and it is often enough used to give publicity to the greatest falsehoods, but in an oath seriously administered they shrink with awe, even in a just matter from appealing to that great name; and it is remarkable that many of them would rather suffer a pecuniary or other loss than swear in the name of God, however truly they

might swear. "There are several judicial oaths in use among the Arabs," says Burckhardt, "distinguished by different degrees of sanctity and solemnity. One of the most common in domestic life is to take hold with hand of the *wasat*, or middle tent pole, and to swear 'by the life of their tent and its owner.' A more serious oath, often taken before the kadi, is called the 'oath of the wood.' To try the veracity of a person, a small piece of wood, or some straw, is taken up from the ground, and presented to him with these words—'Take the wood, and swear by God, and the life of him who caused it to be green and dried it up.' A still more solemn oath is the 'oath of the cross lines,' which is used only on very important occasions. Thus, if a Bedouin accuses his neighbour of a considerable theft, and cannot prove the fact by witnesses, the plaintiff takes the defendant before the sheik or kadi, and calls him to swear in his defence whatever oath he may choose to demand from him. If he complies readily, his accuser leads him to a certain distance from the camp, because the magical nature of the oath might prove pernicious to the general body of the Arabs were it to take place in their vicinity. He then with his *sekin*, or crooked knife, draws on the sand a large circle, with many cross lines inside it. He obliges the defendant to place his right foot within the circle, he himself doing the same, and addressing him in the following words, which the accused is obliged to repeat—'By God, and in God, and through God, (I swear) I did not take it, and it is not in my possession.'"

Abraham swore to Abimelech that he would not deal falsely "with him, nor with his son, nor with his son's son." There is an incident recorded by Bruce which illustrates this statement. He received from an Arab sheik a pledge that he would not be molested in his journey across the Desert to Cosseir, and he considers it to be the same kind of oath "in use among the Arabs or shepherds" in the time of Abraham. "I told him: (the

sheikh) I was bound to Cosseir," says Bruce, "and that if I found myself in any difficulty I hoped, upon applying to his people, they would protect me, and that he would give them the word that I was *Yagoube*, a physician, seeking no harm, but doing good; bound by a vow for a certain time to wander through deserts, from fear of God, and that they should not have it in their power to do me harm. The great people among them came, and after joining hands repeated a kind of prayer, of about two minutes long, by which they declared themselves and their children accursed if ever they lifted their hands against me in the *tell*, or field, in the desert, or on the river; or in case that I or mine should fly to them for refuge, if they did not protect us at the risk of their lives, their families, and their fortunes; or, as they emphatically expressed it, to the death of the last male child among them."

The next and most remarkable incident in the Patriarch's life is connected with his readiness to offer Isaac in sacrifice on Mount Moriah. The particulars of this extraordinary transaction are well known, and it is one of the most distinguished examples of obedience and of faith in the Divine promises on record. The command to sacrifice Isaac did not excite any surprise in Abraham, and hence it has been stated with great probability that the custom of parents offering their children in sacrifice was followed in Canaan, by the ancient inhabitants. According to Josephus, Isaac was at this time twenty-seven years of age; but whatever was his age, he had certainly attained the state of manhood, and it is not to be supposed that Abraham used, or was able to use, any coercion on this occasion. He seems to have concealed the purport of the journey from Isaac to the last moment, who readily acquiesced in the necessity of obedience. It is also apparent that Abraham entertained no other idea but that the command would be actually enforced. From the account of it given by St Paul, the Patriarch thoroughly believed that "God was able to raise up Isaac even

from the dead." This is clearly indicated in the narrative. When he set out with Isaac he took no notice of the object of his journey to Sarah, and when he arrived at the appointed scene of the sacrifice he told his servant, "Abide ye here with the ass, and I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you." He thus had not the smallest doubt but that he would return with Isaac alive, and restored in a remarkable manner. The act of faith, however, was sufficiently demonstrated by his being prepared to obey the Divine command to the full extent, and the deliberate manner in which he acted. A ram caught in the thicket by the horns was substituted for Isaac, and Abraham was commended in the most magnificent manner. The Mahometans pretend that the horns of this ram were fixed upon the temple of Mecca by the ancient Arabians, and that they were taken down by Mahomet to prevent idolatry.

We now notice the death of Sarah, in the hundred and twenty-seventh year of her age. This event took place in Kirjath-Arba, afterwards called Hebron. There is a tradition that she died while Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac, and that her death was caused by being informed that the sacrifice had actually been made, but this is altogether fallacious, for she lived many years after that transaction, and we have seen that neither she, nor the domestics who accompanied Abraham on the occasion, had the slightest knowledge of the nature of the expedition. It is probable, however, from the manner in which her death is announced that Abraham was absent from Hebron at the time, and that he hastened to "mourn for Sarah and weep for her" when he received the intelligence; though some understand the narrative simply to intimate that Abraham came from his own tent to sit mourning on the ground at the door of the tent of Sarah.

But the Patriarch, notwithstanding his grief, had the last solemn rites of humanity to discharge, and it was necessary for him, as he finely expresses it, to

procure a place to "bury his dead out of his sight." For this purpose he addressed the Hittites—the Children of Heth in Hebron, entreating their permission to be allowed to bury his wife among them, for being a stranger, and having no land of his own, he could claim no right of interment in any sepulchre in that district. The Hittites replied to him with great courtesy, complimenting him for his wealth and property, and assuring him that he might select any one of their sepulchres to bury his dead. But as the Patriarch wished to secure a sepulchre for himself and his descendants also, he was not satisfied with this permission. He told them that if they really were sincere they could assist him to purchase a sepulchre by negotiating with Ephron, one of their number, and the first of their nation who comes under our notice by name in the Scriptures—for the cave of the field of Macpelah, and the field in which it was situated. The request was communicated to Ephron, who seemed readily disposed to relinquish the property. Feeling the advantage of laying so great a person as Abraham under an obligation, he even offered to *give* it to him freely, but the Patriarch was not disposed to accede to the obligation in the manner in which it was tendered, and insisted on paying at once the value of the property. Ephron told him that the land was worth four hundred shekels of silver (about L.45 sterling), "but what," said he, "is that between me and thee?" If we are to judge from the present customs of Oriental nations, we might reasonably infer that selfishness was prominently exhibited by Ephron in his reply—that he only pretended to act liberally towards the Patriarch by offering him the ground at such a price, trusting that some future opportunity might occur which he could turn to advantage. The bargain was concluded; Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver in the presence of the necessary witnesses—"current money with the merchant; and the field of Ephron, which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre, the field,

and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, that were in all the borders round about, were made sure unto Abraham for a possession in the presence of the Children of Heth, before all that went in at the gate of his city." Here Abraham buried Sarah, the mother of the chosen people, with the solemnities peculiar to the country and the times. It may be here observed that the event now noticed affords the earliest instance on record of the practice, formerly very prevalent in the East, of depositing the dead in natural or artificial caves, the arrangement and extent of which varied with circumstances. Numerous instances of such caves occur in Egypt, Syria, and Persia. Interment in caves or sepulchral vaults was always preferred by those who could obtain it, and where there were no natural caves it was customary to hew sepulchres out of the rock for such families as were able to incur the necessary expense.

Abraham was now old, and "gone into days," and his thoughts naturally turned towards his son Isaac. Before the death of Sarah he had been told of the family of his brother Nahor, and he resolved to select a wife for his son from his own kindred. For this purpose he despatched his steward Eliezer to Haran in Mesopotamia where his relative Nahor resided, with full authority to form an alliance, making him swear a solemn oath that he would observe the conditions imposed upon him, and that on no account was he to stipulate that Isaac was to return to his father's native country. The anxiety of the Patriarchs to marry their sons to wives of their own family is often intimated in the Scriptures, and is inferred from the peculiar manner in which marriages are mentioned which were against this regulation. This principle is maintained by the Jews at the present day, and among the Bedouin Arabs, although there is no regulation precluding the intermarriages of different tribes, yet in practice a man seldom takes a wife from any other tribe than his own. Eliezer was successful in his expedition,

and Rebekah willingly assented to accompany him to Canaan. It is evident that the party under Eliezer in this route was numerous, as we read of ten camels laden with presents to the Patriarch's kindred. When Eliezer returned with the fair Rebekah, he told "Isaac all things that he had done, and Isaac brought her into his mother Sarah's tent, and took Rebekah, and she became his wife, and he loved her; and Isaac was comforted after his mother's death."

The notices which the inspired historian gives us of the illustrious Patriarch after the marriage of Isaac are exceedingly limited. We are told that he again "took a wife, and her name was Keturah." Many of the Jews insist that this Keturah was Hagar, whom Abraham recalled after the death of Sarah—an opinion altogether unworthy of credit. Others think that she had been born in his household, like Eliezer his steward, and that she was chief among the women, as he was among the men-servants. Others, again, are inclined to think she was a Canaanite. The probable conjecture is, that, whoever she was, Keturah had become the Patriarch's secondary wife, and had borne him children before the death of Sarah; and that she was subsequently elevated to the station of matron or principal wife in his household. The ordinary usages of the East strengthen these conjectures, which are farther supported by considering the great age of Abraham at the death of Sarah, and that his sons by Keturah were old enough to be sent away to form independent tribes by themselves before his own death. He had by her six sons, who became the heads of so many Arab tribes. According to the custom of the country, he provided for those sons during his lifetime, giving them suitable property, and commanded them to settle at a distance from the family, eastward in the Arabian desert. The sons of Abraham by Keturah were Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak, and Shuah. It is probable that Ishmael, the son of the other concubine, received a

better provision than either of these, but the great bulk of his property was assigned by the Patriarch to his only lawful son Isaac.

We have no particulars of the death of Abraham, which took place in the hundred and seventy-fifth year of his age, B.C. 1821. We are briefly told that "he gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years, and was gathered to his people." He was buried by his sons Isaac and Ishmael in the cave of Machpelah, by the side of Sarah, and the place is preserved by tradition to the present time.

The history of Abraham suggests some very important reflections, but these for obvious reasons must be omitted. In whatever way we consider him, he certainly is exhibited to us as one of the most illustrious characters in sacred or profane antiquity. As a pastoral prince we find him remarkably developing all the peculiar manners of the Oriental nomades; but it is as the "father of the faithful," and as the "friend of God," that he is most prominently delineated to posterity, with a peculiar reference to the great dispensations of which the covenant formed with him was preliminary. He is the only father of a nation whose descendants can be traced in a clear and uninterrupted manner from his time to the present day, and whose history forms one of the most remarkable and impressive episodes in the annals of the world.

A curious life of Abraham could be compiled from the traditions of the East, for all the Orientals—Christians, Mahometans, Indians, and Infidels—have traditions of this Patriarch, and hold his memory in the highest veneration. He is probably the Brahma of the Hindoos, as he was the Zerdosht or Zoroaster of the Persian Magi, or worshippers of fire, because when thrown, as it is pretended, by Nimrod into a fiery furnace, he came out of it unhurt, the fire having *caressed and treated* him as a friend. The Emperor Alexander Severus conceived so high an idea of Abraham's character, from what the Jews and Christians relat-

ed, that he ranked him with our Saviour among his deities. Nor has his history escaped embellishment by a variety of fictions. It has been alleged that he was king of Damascus—that he taught the Egyptians arithmetic and astronomy—that he invented letters, and the Hebrew language, or the Syriac and Chaldee characters—and that he was the author of several works, particularly one on the Creation, which some Rabbins hold in great estimation. The Jews also allege that he wrote the Morning Prayer, the 89th Psalm, a treatise on Idolatry, and other works. Among the Mahometans he is held in the highest veneration. Places consecrated to him are forbidden to be trod by Christian feet, and his mosques are held peculiarly sacred. The Mussulmans also maintain that he took a journey to Mecca, and began to build a temple in that city in conjunction with Ishmael, whom they maintain to be the true son of the promise. They farther relate that Nimrod made war against Abraham, and as the tyrant was about to fall on the Patriarch with his whole army, he sent a soldier to him with this message—"O Abraham, it is now time to fight, where is thy army?"—"It will come immediately," replied the Patriarch, and instantly the air was darkened by a cloud of guats, which devoured Nimrod's soldiers to the very bones.

ABSALOM, the favourite son of David by Maacah, the daughter of Talmou, king of Geshur, was brother of Tamar, who was ravished by Amnon, their eldest brother by another mother. He waited till a convenient opportunity occurred to revenge this infamous injury done to his sister, and at last accomplished the assassination of Amnon at a feast to which he had invited all the king's sons. He immediately fled for refuge to the king of Geshur, with whom he resided three years, but Joab at length procured leave for him to return, on the condition that he would never attempt to appear in the royal presence. He accordingly returned to Jerusalem, but becoming impatient of the restraint, after living two years

estranged from the royal court he endeavoured to induce Joab to represent him favourably to his father. Joab delayed to answer his message in proper time, and the impetuous Absalom ordered one of his fields of corn to be set on fire. This induced Joab to visit him and expostulate with him on his wanton conduct, but no serious altercation ensued, for we find Absalom at this very interview prevailing upon the former to procure his father's leave to see him, in which he was successful.

No sooner was Absalom restored to his father's favour than he began to put those designs into operation which he had long contemplated, and to form a conspiracy to dethrone David. He studiously insinuated himself into the affections of the people, and as he had the external advantage of a handsome person, he soon procured many followers, and became extremely popular. To facilitate his projects he pretended that during his exile he had made a vow to sacrifice in Hebron, and he accordingly proceeded to that city. Here he raised the standard of rebellion. He caused himself to be proclaimed king, and the revolt assumed such a serious aspect that David was compelled to fly from Jerusalem.

Absalom marched to the metropolis soon afterwards, which he entered without opposition. Here, in compliance with the counsel of Ahitophel, he committed some shocking depravities, and he was likewise advised to pursue his father while his army was in a weak condition, but this was overruled by Hushai, who was secretly in David's interest, and who represented to Absalom the certain danger of attacking men whose circumstances had made them desperate. Ahitophel, seeing his counsel rejected, hanged himself in despair, while Hushai sent a trusty messenger to David, advising him immediately to pass the Jordan. The armies of the father and the son encountered each other, but though that of Absalom was vastly superior in numbers he was defeated in the Wood of Ephraim, where 20,000 of his followers were slain.

The inspired historian tells us that "the wood destroyed more people than the sword," and Josephus also assures us that "a greater number perished as they fled through woods and down precipices than in the fight."

Absalom himself fled, and in his haste his head was caught by the branches of an oak, and he was suspended in the air. His neck was so completely wedged between the boughs by the swift motion of his mule, that he was not able to disengage himself. Josephus maintains that he was hung by his long hair, which got warped about the branches, and Bochart inclines to the same opinion. In this condition he was found by Joab very nearly dead, who, notwithstanding the express command of David that his life should be spared, thrust him through with three darts, and killed him. His body was thrown into a pit in the wood, and covered with a heap of stones. The lamentation of David over this ambitious and dangerous son is well known. He was slain B.C. 1023. Absalom had three sons and one daughter, 2 Sam. xiv. 27; but the Hebrew doctors agree in stating that they all died before him.

A structure called *Absalom's Tomb* is still pointed out in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, which of course has no connection with him whose name it bears. The inspired historian informs us that during his lifetime he had raised a pillar in the King's Dale, or Valley of Jehoshaphat, to perpetuate his memory. The weight of Absalom's hair has caused great disputes among commentators, but as these are very unsatisfactory, it is unnecessary to do more than allude to them in this place. It appears from the manner in which it is noticed that the custom of men wearing their hair short, or of shaving the head, had not come into use, except on occasions of mourning, and in the time of David it was reckoned a peculiar ornament, of which there is also an intimation in the Song of Songs. Josephus, moreover, informs us that the chosen men who formed the guard of that monarch wore their hair in long

flowing tresses, which they sprinkled every morning with gold dust, after anointing it, so that their heads glittered in the sun-beams as reflected from the gold. The custom of men wearing long hair was reckoned a shame in the time of St Paul.

ACHAICUS, a disciple of St Paul, whom that Apostle recommends to the peculiar respect of the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 17. In conjunction with Stephanus and Fortunatus he was the bearer of St Paul's First Epistle to the Church of Corinth, A.D. 56.

ACHAN, the son of Carmi, of the tribe of Judah, was stoned to death in the valley of Achor for covetously transgressing the Divine command promulgated by Joshua. As *Achan*, the name of the valley, which was at no great distance from Jericho, means *trouble*, it is generally agreed that it is the proper name of the man, and it is accordingly given *Achar* in another passage (1 Chron. xi. 7), and it is invariably so written in the Syriac version and by Josephus.

The crime which Achan or Achar committed, and which was the cause of his unhappy fate, was the secretly appropriating to himself a "goodly Babylonish garment," and "two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight," against the express injunction of Jehovah in reference to that devoted city. The Babylonish garment means literally a *garment of Shinar*, of which Babylon was afterwards the famous capital, for though that city had been founded long before this time, it was not distinguished for its luxury, refinement, and improved manufactures, until between eight and nine centuries after the time of Joshua, when it became at the fall of Nineveh the metropolis of a powerful empire. The mantle, therefore, which seduced Achan was in all probability manufactured at some place in Shinar, a district which had thus early acquired a reputation for its manufactured robes, and which made the city of Babylon long distinguished in subsequent times. Josephus describes the robe concealed by

Achan as a "royal garment interwoven with gold." The value of the silver might be nearly L.28, and of the gold perhaps more than L.90, but this is mere conjecture, reckoning the silver at five shillings per ounce, and the ingot of gold at L.4 per ounce, as there is no information of the value of the precious metals in the time of Joshua.

The manner in which the discovery was made is worthy of notice. Some days after the destruction of Jericho, Joshua sent three thousand men against the little city of Ai, who were defeated and put to flight by the enemy. This disaster alarmed the Hebrew leader, and he besought Jehovah in the most earnest terms to have mercy on his people. A Divine communication informed him that the cause of this misfortune was the "taking of the accursed thing," and he was ordered to "sanctify the people." Joshua immediately assembled the people, and Achan was discovered to be the transgressor. There are various opinions as to the manner in which the discovery was made on this occasion. Le Clerc contends that the high priest Eleazar stood in his pontifical garments, and pronounced what Jehovah had suggested to him. The Rabbins allege that every tribe was made to pass before the ark, and that the guilty tribe stood still before it, unable to move themselves out of the place. Others contend that every tribe passed separately before the High Priest, who was arrayed in his breastplate, and that the tribe of Judah was discovered to be guilty, because the sound of the precious stone in the pectoral, on which the name of that tribe was engraven, ceased immediately. But it is most probable that the usual method was followed, and that they cast lots to discover first the tribe, then the family, next the household, and lastly the individual.

Joshua addressed Achan in mild and affectionate language to confess his crime. "My son," he said, "give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him." It has been argued that this passage intimates the

immortality of the soul, as Achan would not be induced by any other consideration to confess a crime which he knew would subject him to capital punishment, and it is the opinion of the Jews that God will pardon crimes in the world to come, when the guilty person confesses and suffers death for them. Achan acknowledged that he had appropriated the Babylonian garment and the gold and silver, which he informed Joshua were concealed in the ground under his tent. Joshua immediately passed sentence upon him, and they took him, "and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had, and they brought them to the valley of Achor, and all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones." A heap of stones was raised over the place to commemorate the event.

Some commentators contend that the stoning of Achan was nothing else than this heap of stones raised over his ashes, but it is probable that he was bound to a stake to be burnt, and stoned to death at the same time, which is a common punishment inflicted on offenders in Oriental countries; or, that he was literally stoned to death, then burnt, and this heap of stones thrown upon his ashes as a mark of the detestation in which the Israelites held his crime. It has also been doubted whether we are to understand the inspired historian as intimating that Achan's sons and daughters were put to death with him. It is certain that the Mosaic Law enjoins that "the fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but that every man shall be put to death for his own sin;" and some of the Talmudists, in order to reconcile this just statute with the destruction of Achan's family, assure us that they were accomplices in his crime, because it was impossible to conceal in his tent what he had stolen without their knowledge. Others assert that the intimation—"and they stoned them,"

as it is in the Hebrew, and not *him*, as is our translation—refers to Achan and his cattle, and that his sons and daughters were brought forth to receive Joshua's exhortations with the rest of the people that they should avoid such crimes as that for which Achan was punished, and not with any design to put them to death with their father. The Rabbins also tell us that Achan was burnt as a sacrilegious person, and stoned to death for breaking the Sabbath, and committing the theft on that day, and it is doubtless true that sacrilege was punished by burning, and the breach of the Sabbath in the Wilderness by stoning to death; but the inspired historian clearly intimates that his family were punished with him as privy to his crime. As the case of Achan was a singular one, it is probable that it was determined precisely by the declared Law, and we may safely conclude that the severity of the punishment was necessary to keep the Hebrews in awe, and to enforce upon them an entire submission to the Divine commands.

ACHIOR was a general of the Ammonites, who freely remonstrated with Holofernes concerning the power of the Jews, and endeavoured to impress him with an idea of that peculiar favour with which God had always regarded them. When Holofernes—who appears to have never been in Judea before, and who was either very ignorant of the state of the Jews, or who wished to ascertain whether they were in league with the Arabians or Egyptians—found that the Jews, who had recently returned from the captivity of Babylon, had shut their gates against him, he called the princes of Moab and Ammon together, and inquired who they were who thus presumed to resist him. Achior replied that they were descended from the Chaldeans, and that they originally dwelt in Mesopotamia, which they were compelled to leave because they would not worship the Chaldean idols, and settle in Canaan, of which they were now the possessors. Achior likewise informed Holofernes of Jacob's journey into Egypt, of the wonders performed

there by Moses, and of the conquest of the Promised Land; and he urged that, before the siege of Bethulia should be attempted, it would be well to ascertain in what degree of favour the Jews then stood with their God, otherwise it would be vain and most fatal to attack them. His advice was received with the utmost indignation, and the officers of the army were so enraged at him that they resolved to destroy him. Holofernes also reproached him in the strong language peculiar to the manner in which the ancient Oriental kings were flattered by their subjects. "Who art thou, Achior, and the hirelings of Ephraim, that thou hast prophesied against us to-day, and hast said that we should not make war with the people of Israel, because their God will defend them? And who is God but Nabuchodonozor? They shall utterly perish, saith King Nabuchodonozor, lord of all the earth." He then commanded a party of his soldiers to seize Achior, and deliver him up to the Jews in Bethulia. When they were approaching the city, however, they found it impossible to come near it on account of the slingers, who cast stones at them, and they left Achior bound at the foot of the hill, and returned to their commander. When the Jews saw him in this condition they sent a party who brought him into the city, and loosed him. He informed them of the cause of his being treated in that manner, and he was received into the house of Ozias, of the tribe of Simeon, one of the governors of the city. Soon after this the head of Holofernes, which had been cut off by Judith, was brought to Achior, who was seized with great terror at the sight, and fell on the ground; but when he recovered, he expressed his gratitude to the heroic Jewess in the strongest language, became a proselyte to the Jewish religion, and was circumcised.

It has been asked how it was possible for Achior, who was an Ammonite, to be numbered among the chosen people, when it was expressly commanded by Moses "that an Ammonite or Moabite shall not

enter into the congregation of the Lord, even to the tenth generation." These words, however, are capable of various definitions, and it is generally agreed that neither the Ammonites nor Moabites, nor even the Canaanites, were forbidden to turn to the true God; but the Jews were expressly commanded never to admit them to any share in the offices, honours, or privileges, peculiar to their nation. It appears from the history that Achior had previously considered the God of the Jews simply as the God of a particular people, and though he admitted his Divine Power, which had been so often manifested in favour of the Jews, he never imagined that this power extended beyond the nation which he had chosen. But he now renounced his former idolatry, and declared his belief in the omnipotent and universal power of the God of Israel, submitting likewise to circumcision, the great characteristic of the Jewish nation.

ACHISH was the son of Maach, king of Gath, to whom David fled for refuge to escape Saul's designs against his life. It is not a little surprising that David, who was held by the Philistines as their greatest enemy, should have trusted himself in the hands of Achish, and even carry the sword of Goliath with him. He could never suppose for a moment that he would not be known at Gath, and he appears to have thought that Achish would be glad of an opportunity to attach a man of his own importance to his interest. In this he calculated rightly, as we find Achish giving him a very kind reception when he fled to him a second time. David, however, on this occasion was exposed to the machinations of the king's officers at Gath, who told Achish that this was the same David who was well known for the injuries he had inflicted on their nation. David became so terrified at the probable result of this information that he feigned himself mad, until he had an opportunity of effecting his escape. The Rabbins tell us that David wrote these words upon the doors of the city—"Achish, king of Gath, owes

mean hundred millions of pieces of gold;" but this is one of their idle fancies. We are informed that he "let his spittle fall on his beard," in other words, he foamed at the mouth, and it is well known that the ancients were afraid of persons in that condition.

Some years afterwards David sent to Achish to offer his service, and to request his protection, which was granted, and he was allowed to proceed to Gath with six hundred men and their wives and children. It is not certain whether this was the same Achish or his son. When he had continued there for some time, David desired Achish to allot to him a town in the country as a residence for himself and his followers, and the king immediately gave him Ziklag, which had been first given to the tribe of Judah, and afterwards to that of Simeon, but the Philistines had taken and kept possession of it, till it became the peculiar inheritance of David and his successors even after the division of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. From this place David made frequent excursions with his followers, and plundered the inhabitants of the adjacent districts, the Geshurites, Gezerites, and Amalekites, "saving neither man nor woman alive." During these excursions he made Achish believe that he was plundering the country of Judah. Two years afterwards, when the Philistines were about to take the field against the Israelites, Achish summoned David to attend him in the battle, and told him that his confidence was so great in him that he could trust him with his life; but the Philistine leaders, who dreaded that David might abandon them in the heat of the battle, advised the king to dismiss him, which he did with great reluctance, assuring David at the same time in the strongest language that he had no doubt of his integrity. David was doubtless well pleased to be relieved from the disagreeable condition in which he was placed by his alliance with Achish, for if he had continued in the Philistine army, though he might have taken no part against his own countrymen, it would

have been a great obstacle to his obtaining the kingdom. David returned to Ziklag on the morning after he had been reluctantly dismissed by Achish, which he found had been plundered during his absence by the Amalekites. After this we have no account of Achish, and we find David remaining with him only a short time after the battle of Gilboa, which terminated fatally to Saul and his sons, and he removed from Ziklag to Hebron in the tribe of Judah.

ACHSAH, or OCSEH, a daughter of Caleb, who was promised by her father as a reward to him who took Kirjath-Sepher, which had fallen to his lot. In the East the bridegroom offers to the father of his intended wife a sum of money, or value to his satisfaction, before he can expect his daughter in marriage, and Caleb therefore offered his daughter as a reward of honour, without demanding the accustomed dowry. Othniel, the nephew of Caleb, took the town, and married Achsah. When she was proceeding to her husband's house after the celebration of the marriage, Othniel persuaded her to request from her father a particular field which contained springs of water—one of the most valuable possessions in Judea. Caleb complied, and Othniel obtained an important acquisition. The value of springs and wells of water is often intimated in the Scriptures, and can only be thoroughly appreciated by those who are conversant with Oriental countries.

ADAM, the father of the human race, was formed by the Almighty Creator on the sixth day of the creation of the world. His body was made of the dust of the ground, and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living organized body, with a rational soul. He was formed, we are told, in the "image of God," and after the likeness of the Divine Creator—an expression which must be understood in a figurative sense. He was placed by Jehovah in the garden prepared for him in his state of innocence—the irrational animals were made to pass before him, to whom he

gave appropriate names—he was made to fall into a deep sleep, during which the mother of the human race was formed, and when he awoke he knew that the woman was “bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh.” But the eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree, to which the woman had been tempted by the serpent, made him forfeit the innocence of his nature and the happiness of the terrestrial paradise, and the fallen pair were expelled to encounter all the vicissitudes of the world, to which they had rendered themselves and their descendants liable, and to earn their bread by the labour of their hands. Adam called his wife Eve, and after the expulsion from Eden, his two sons, Cain and Abel, and afterwards Seth, were born. He had several other sons and daughters whose names are not recorded, and he died at the age of nine hundred and thirty years.

These are all the authentic particulars respecting Adam, but many things are related of him by several fanciful and speculative writers, some of which may be considered as neither repugnant to what is said of him in the Scriptures nor very improbable, whilst others are doubtful and fabulous. The Rabbins have given free scope to their imaginations concerning him, and have asserted some extravagant and monstrous chimeras respecting his creation, his extensive knowledge, the beauty of his person, his stature, and his sepulchre. Nor have some Christian writers been behind the Rabbins in their whimsical and idle speculations. His salvation has been doubted, and even absolutely denied; it has been maintained that he was one of the first who rose from the dead with our Saviour—that he made a speech to his descendants before he died—and that he recommended them to honour their mother, and to bury her by his side. The Rabbins allege that he wrote several books, particularly one on the Creation, and another on the Deity; he is said to be the author of the 92d Psalm; and we are told that in some manuscripts the Chaldee title of this Psalm expressly declares that it is the

song of praise which the first man repeated for the Sabbath-day. A Mahometan writer informs us that when the Patriarch Abraham was in the country of the Sabeans he opened Adam's trunk, and found in it the books which he had written, with those of Seth and Edris—the name they give to Enoch. It is also pretended that he was possessed of twenty books which fell from heaven, and that these books contained a number of the laws, promises, and threatenings of the Almighty Creator, and the predictions of many future events.

The Koran contains a number of curious particulars concerning Adam, which have been embellished by the luxuriant fancies of Mahometan commentators. Thus, we are informed in the Koran—“We created man of dried clay and black mud, but as for the genii, we had before created them of a subtle fire.” A commentator on these words informs us, that God caused rain to fall for several days on the earth of which Adam's body was formed, and the clay was left to dry some time before it was animated. The Persian Moslems designate Adam the *Prophet* and the *Caliph*—titles which they bestow on none but legislators. The notions of the ancient Arabians with respect to the Fall are not very different from the account in Scripture, from which indeed they are all borrowed and arranged. Some Mahometan legends relate that Adam built a chapel at Mecca, which was a model of the fourth heaven, after he was expelled from Paradise. These are illustrations of the many extravagant opinions which have been given to the world respecting our great progenitor.

The consideration of the state of Adam in Paradise, of the Fall, of its consequences, of the promise then given of human restoration, and of its complete accomplishment in the person of “the second Adam, the Lord from heaven,” would lead into a multiplicity of discussions unnecessary in this place; and there are numerous treatises on these subjects by learned writers, which are

easily accessible to those who wish to study them with attention. In the language of Stackhouse—"As long as St Paul's Epistles are read, the original compact between God and man, the depravation of human nature, and the imputation of Adam's guilt, must be received as standing doctrines of the Church of Christ; but then we are to take great care in our manner of explaining them, to preserve the Divine attributes sacred and inviolate, and this may happily be effected if we will but suppose that our hereditary corruption is occasioned not by the infusion of any positive malignity into us, but by the subduction of natural gifts from us—that the covenant of grace commenced immediately after the covenant of works was broken, and has included all mankind ever since—that the blood of Christ shields his children from the wrath of God—and that the imputation of Adam's guilt and obnoxiousness to punishment is effectually taken away by the meritorious oblation of that *Lamb of God, which was slain from the foundation of the world.*"

The Greek Christians class Adam and Eve with all the righteous of the Old Testament, and honour them on the Sunday before Christmas; and they commemorate the expulsion from Eden on the first day of their Lent, which is the 4th of February. Some Latin martyrologies honour Adam on the 24th of April, and others place his creation and death on the 25th of March, with the evident design of bringing the first Adam nearer to the second, who, according to the belief of many of the ancients, was conceived and died on the same day.

ADONI-BEZEK, literally *Lord of Bezek*, was king of the city and district of Bezek when the Israelites effected the conquest of Canaan. After the death of Joshua, the tribes of Simeon and Judah marched against him, and defeated his army of Canaanites and Perizzites, killed ten thousand of his men, and took himself prisoner. They cut off his thumbs and great toes, and in this condition he

was carried to Jerusalem, where he died. The punishment inflicted on Adoni-bezek by the victors was a just retaliation for the cruelties practised by himself, and, indeed, we find him acknowledging this retributive justice from God. He had at various times taken no fewer than seventy petty kings or chiefs, whose thumbs and great toes he had ordered to be cut off, and made them gather their food under his table, using those unfortunate chiefs whom he had conquered in the most degrading manner. In ancient times cruel mutilations were often inflicted on prisoners of consequence taken in war, if they were not instantly put to death. The deprivation of the thumbs rendered the person incapable of ever afterwards handling arms, and the mutilation of the feet prevented him from running swiftly—an essential quality in a warrior. It was common also to put out the eyes of prisoners of rank, which is still practised in Persia even upon those subjects who are considered dangerous or designing by the king. Sir John Malcolm mentions several instances of this in his "Sketches of Persia."

ADONIJAH was the fourth son of David by Hagith, or, as Josephus calls her, *Ægitha*, and was born at Hebron during the time his father was acknowledged king by only one part of Israel, the other part continuing faithful to Ishbosheth, the son of Saul. As his elder brothers Amnon and Absalom were dead, Adonijah thought himself the legitimate successor to the throne, and he resolved to procure himself to be acknowledged king before the death of his father, who was at this time extremely reduced by old age, and scarcely able to administer the government. For this purpose he appeared in public in an imposing manner, maintaining "chariots and horsemen, and fifty men to run before him," and as he was undoubtedly the eldest son of the royal family, and greatly beloved by his father, he had a very strong and influential party in his favour. His chief supporters were Joab, the commander of David's armies, and Abithar, the high

priest. Those two influential persons had particular inducements to support the claims of Adonijah. Joab, who wanted to secure his own authority and continue at the head of military affairs, naturally concluded that nothing could more effectually accomplish this object than to have a king who was obliged to him for the crown, and whom he could always keep in a state of dependance. He had great influence, moreover, with the army, and his well known resolution and enterprising genius gave him considerable weight with the people—facts of which Adonijah was duly sensible. Abiathar was as influential over the priests and Levites, who at all times formed a very powerful body in the state, and were distinguished by their rank and employments.

It appears that at this period of the Jewish monarchy the order of succession was not regulated in any particular manner, and, indeed, we find that Jehovah appointed whom he pleased to be king, as in the cases of Saul and David. No regard was manifested to family or even rank in the original selection, the merits of the individual and the determination of God being the sole essentials; but Jehovah, from a particular favour towards David, was pleased to confirm the kingdom to him and his direct descendants. The Hebrews were well acquainted with this peculiar feature of their constitution, and at this time it had not been declared whether the eldest son should succeed the father. We know, however, that it was a general custom in all nations for the eldest son to possess the right of succession, and Adonijah evidently appeared as the successor of his father, either disregarding or not being aware of the promise which David had given to his wife Bathsheba of leaving the kingdom to their son Solomon—a promise which had received the Divine sanction. The people were in suspense between Adonijah and Solomon, and waited for the king's public declaration before they acknowledged either of the expectants. It thus appears that the order of birth was inferior to the choice and will of the king, and the

same peculiarity of succession was followed by the kings of Judah who succeeded David. When the reigning king died without making any declaration, the eldest son succeeded in the ordinary way, but we find instances of the kings appointing, long before their death, the particular son who was to possess the crown.

There were at this time two high priests, Abiathar and Zadok, both of the family of Aaron, but of different branches, Abiathar being descended from Ithamar, and Zadok from Eleazar. The former was appointed by David, and the latter had been elevated in the time of Saul; and David, when he obtained full possession of the kingdom, allowed them both to retain their office. As they espoused the cause of different parties, we may infer that there was no great harmony between them—Zadok attaching himself to the interests of Solomon, from a well founded conviction that he was destined to be the certain successor of David. Benaiah, a man distinguished for his valour, between whom and Joab a keen jealousy existed, and who commanded the royal guards, called the Cherethites and Pelethites, and the Prophet Nathan, who was peculiarly esteemed by David, with a very considerable portion of the army, also opposed Adonijah, or at least were not of his party; and Josephus tells us that none of the "most valiant men of David favoured his designs."

Adonijah, in prosecution of his great object, invited all his father's sons except Solomon, and all the chief men of the kingdom with the exception of Nathan, Zadok, and Benaiah, to a splendid entertainment near a fountain in the royal garden at the foot of Mount Zion near Jerusalem, which may be considered the same as the Pool of Siloam, Josh. xv. 7; 1 Kings i. 9; John ix. 7. On this occasion "sheep, and oxen, and fat cattle," were killed and dressed on the spot—a custom still common in Oriental feasts of this description. From the proximity of the place to the city it is evident that

Adonijah's party affected no secrecy of their intentions, and, indeed, they were doing nothing contrary to law, as it was unknown to most of them who was to be David's successor in the kingdom. The king had nominated Solomon, but he had done so to merely a few individuals, and it is by no means certain that he would have preferred that prince if he had not been aware that such was the Divine will. We are told that he *loved* Solomon, but we know that he also loved Absalom and Adonijah, and it is difficult to suppose that his affection to any of his sons could exceed that which he exhibited towards the former, notwithstanding his rebellious and criminal conduct.

The object of Adonijah at this entertainment was to procure himself to be proclaimed king, and to assume the government before David's death. It appears that his guests were willing to recognize his claims, and actually did so, or at least pledged themselves to support him. But the Prophet Nathan instantly sought an interview with Bathsheba, told her of the whole proceedings of the festive party, and exhorted her to lose no time in seeking the king, and procuring his positive declaration of the succession of Solomon. He farther informed her that he would join her in the king's presence, and confirm the report she gave of Adonijah's proceedings. Bathsheba, who was naturally devoted to the interests of her son Solomon, lost no time in following the directions of the Prophet. She repaired to David's apartments, reminded him of the solemn promise he had given that Solomon was to be his successor, and detailed to him the proceedings of Adonijah and his friends in the neighbouring valley, all of which was confirmed by Nathan. The aged monarch not only renewed his promise, but ordered Nathan, Zadok, and Benaiah, to proclaim Solomon his successor that very day, to end all disputes about the right to the throne. This was accordingly done. They placed Solomon on the king's mule, surrounded by the royal guards, and "Zadok the priest took an

horn of oil out of the tabernacle, and anointed Solomon; and they blew the trumpet, and all the people said, God save King Solomon. And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them." It is to be observed that this ceremony of anointing, which was performed with the sacred oil, was very little observed afterwards, when the kingdom of Judah became hereditary in David's family. It appears to have been chiefly practised when there was some difficulty about the succession, and when there were competitors, for the crown, as in this case of Solomon, and the subsequent one of Jehoash.

Solomon was proclaimed at Gihon, a fountain or spring in the valley west of Jerusalem, Adonijah's festive party being at that very time assembled in the quarter of the valley east of the city. Scarcely was the banquet concluded when the shouts of the people and the sounds of music reached them from the neighbouring city, and Joab inquired the cause of the extraordinary and sudden commotion. No sooner had he spoken than Jonathan, the son of Abiathar the high priest, appeared, and informed the guests that Solomon had been proclaimed king by the command of David, narrating at the same time the whole particulars. They were struck with terror at the tidings, and immediately retired. Adonijah, who had the greatest cause to dread the resentment of Solomon, took refuge at the brazen altar of the tabernacle which was at Zion, thus illustrating an ancient custom which seems to have prevailed among all nations in ancient times, of considering altars and temples as asylums. This probably originated from the general opinion that an asylum was a privilege which belonged only to the innocent; and the regard which was paid to these places sometimes prevented even the greatest criminals from being forced to punishment.

Solomon was informed of Adonijah's

retreat, and promised him forgiveness if he would conduct himself peaceably, otherwise he would certainly be put to death. This lenity removed his fears, and in an interview with Solomon he expressed his thanks in a very submissive manner. After the death of David, when Solomon was sole king, Adonijah entreated Bathsheba to use her influence with the king to allow him to marry Abishag, the beautiful Shunammite who had been engaged to cherish David in his old age. Bathsheba probably considered the request as of no great importance, and readily consented to exert herself in his favour, though she might have suspected some design from the manner in which he spoke to her of his loss of the succession on the occasion. "Thou knowest that the kingdom was mine, and that all Israel set their faces upon me that I should reign; howbeit the kingdom is turned about, and is become my brother's, for it was his from the Lord." When Bathsheba made the desired application, Solomon was highly enraged, and replied to his mother in a tone of bitter severity, "Why dost thou ask Abishag the Shunammite for Adonijah? Ask for him the kingdom also, for he is mine elder brother; even for him, and for Abiathar the priest, and for Joab the son of Zeruiah." He solemnly swore to put Adonijah to death that very day, which was done by Benaiah, who was now at the head of the army, but in what manner it is not related.

This action of Solomon has been the subject of animadversion by some distinguished commentators, who accuse him of cruelty, and of exhibiting something like revenge towards his brother. But it must be judged with a reference to the peculiar circumstances of the case as connected with the arrangements of Divine Providence. Adonijah had indeed intimated to Bathsheba that he might have disputed the kingdom with Solomon by the aid of his own followers, though he had relinquished all such design when he found that God had appointed the nomination of his younger brother; but

his party was still entire, and Joab, Abiathar, and the other men of influence who supported his pretensions, were all attached to his interests. He may have entertained some designs against the kingdom, which, considering that he was the eldest son, might have been promoted by his marriage to the fair Shunammite, who had been the late king's wife, though we may admit that he was stimulated as much by love as by ambition. Grotius argues that as it was contrary to the Hebrew custom that those who had formed part of the deceased king's household could be connected with any person but his successor, Adonijah tried Solomon by this method, resolving, if the request was granted, to attempt something of more consequence. Various learned commentators have also justified Solomon's conduct in this transaction, but as their arguments and observations are entirely speculative, it is unnecessary to enter into details. The inspired historian simply narrates the facts; and it is enough for us to know, that the purposes of Jehovah were to be accomplished in this and other instances, though we cannot explain them on the principles of human reasoning.

ADONI-ZEDEC, an ancient king of Jerusalem, who formed a powerful confederation against Joshua during the conquest of Canaan, and who, with his allies, was defeated in a very remarkable manner at Gibeon. He was found concealed in a cave at Makkedah, with four other kings, and they were all put to death by the victorious Hebrew conqueror, who ordered his captains to put their feet upon their necks—a common form of expressing triumph over a fallen adversary in ancient times, not exclusively practised in the East. Adoni-zedec was one of those kings who were numerous in Canaan in remote times, and whose sovereignties were of exceedingly limited extent, often consisting of no more than a single town with a small surrounding district. Such small states existed in the early period of almost every nation, and their history has been generally every where the same, one or more of them either acquiring in the

course of time a sufficient preponderance to absorb the others, or conquered successively by foreign invaders who consolidated them into one kingdom. Ancient history concurs with the Scriptures in numerous instances respecting these little states. Egypt was first divided into them, as were originally Persia, China, Japan, and other countries; and it was the same in ancient Greece, which seems to have contained as many small independent royalties as Canaan. It would be easy to produce examples of a similar nature in modern history, by referring in Europe, to Germany and Italy, to America, to Africa, and to a considerable part of Asia.

ADRAMMELECH, son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, was murdered by his sons, Adrammelech and Sharezer, while worshipping in the temple of his idol Nisroch in Nineveh, after his return from his fatal expedition against King Hezekiah. It is not stated what induced his two sons to commit this parricide. They fled to Armenia, and Esar-haddon their brother succeeded, B.C. 713.

AGABUS, a Prophet mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, who came with other prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch, and predicted a great famine, which occurred in Judea, A.D. 44, in the fourth year of the Emperor Claudius. This famine is mentioned by Josephus and Suetonius. Some years after this Agabus had an interview with St Paul at Casarea, and intimated to the Apostle the sufferings which awaited him at Jerusalem, whither he was about to proceed. The Greeks allege that Agabus was one of the Seventy Disciples of our Saviour, and that he suffered martyrdom at Antioch. They observe his festival on the 9th of March, but the Roman Church since the ninth century commemorates him on the 9th of February.

AGAG, the last king of the Amalekites, a people doomed to extermination for attacking the Hebrews in the Desert of Sinai after they had left Egypt, when they were completely exhausted by fatigue, and barbarously cutting off those

who could not follow or keep up with the main body. Joshua subsequently gained a victory over them, but the original sentence of extermination was ordered to be inflicted four hundred years after it was pronounced, when the unfortunate Agag was their king. The Prophet Samuel was instructed by God to order Saul to march against Agag, and to destroy his nation, and every thing which belonged to them, "man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." Saul assembled an army consisting of 200,000 men, besides 10,000 men of the tribe of Judah, and he entered the country of the Amalekites, and ravaged the whole territory in obedience to the Divine injunction. Nevertheless, he thought proper to spare Agag, and to preserve the best of the cattle and the most valuable part of the spoil. Josephus tells us that Saul spared Agag on account of his noble and commanding person, thus following his own fancy and affection rather than the command of God, and yielding to an unreasonable compassion most dangerous in the circumstances. For this he was severely reprov'd by Samuel, who told him that Jehovah had rejected him from being king, and had resolved to give the kingdom to another on account of his disobedience. The Prophet then ordered Agag, who had entertained hopes that he would escape with impunity, to be brought before him. The prisoner exclaimed, "Surely the bitterness of death is passed," which doubtless implied a petition that he might be spared, but the stern Prophet reproached him for his former cruelties in language which indicates that he had been a relentless tyrant, and "hewed him in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal," either commanding him to be put to death by the officers of justice, or perhaps killing him with his own hands, as Gideon did to Zeba and Zalmunna. This occurred B.C. 1070, and it was the commencement of Saul's misfortunes, who now bitterly repented of his disobedience.

AGRIPPA, called **HEROD AGRIPPA**,

was the son of Aristobulus, and the grandson of Herod the Great. The name *Agrippa*, which is of Latin origin, was usually bestowed on children born in an unusual or irregular manner. The mother of Agrippa was Berenice, the daughter of Herod. A little before the death of his grandfather, Agrippa went to Rome, where he was received among the friends of Drusus, the son of the Emperor Tiberius, and kindly guided by the wise counsels of Antonia, the friend of his mother, and the wife of the elder Drusus, who was brother of the Emperor. During the lifetime of his mother Berenice the conduct of Agrippa was without reproach, and he either wanted the necessary resources to gratify his naturally extravagant habits, or was restrained by fear of exposing himself to her resentment. But when she died he commenced a career of prodigality. He squandered all his property in luxury, and in bestowing presents on the freedmen of the Emperor, which reduced him to the greatest poverty and distress. To add to these embarrassments of his situation his friend and patron Drusus died, and the Emperor refused to see the friends of his deceased son lest their presence should revive his grief. Agrippa was in consequence compelled to leave Rome, and he retired in despair to the castle of Malatha in Idumea, where he resolved either to commit suicide, or to spend the remainder of his life in seclusion. But his wife Cypros, who was also his cousin-german, persuaded him to abandon his design. She wrote to his sister Herodias, who was married to Herod Antipas the Tetrarch, and entreated her to use her influence to afford Agrippa some assistance. Her request was granted, Herod sent for his brother-in-law, relieved him by a sum of money, assigned him an annual pension, and gave him the government of Tiberias.

Agrippa soon became disgusted with his situation. Herod one day reproached him with the favours he had conferred upon him, and ridiculed his depressed circumstances. Agrippa was deeply

offended at this insult, and went to Flaccus, the Proconsul of Syria, whose friendship he had enjoyed at Rome. He was received, as had been his half-brother Aristobulus a short time before him, and though they were at variance, Flaccus was equally kind to them both. But Aristobulus was resolved to do every thing in his power to injure Agrippa in the opinion of Flaccus, and it happened that an opportunity occurred by which he was able to accomplish his designs. The inhabitants of Damascus had some disputes with the inhabitants of Sidon respecting their boundaries, and it was mutually agreed to refer the whole matter to Flaccus for his decision. Agrippa was offered a considerable sum of money by the citizens of Damascus to use his influence with the Proconsul in their favour, with which he readily complied; but Aristobulus contrived to get some information respecting this overture, and told it to Flaccus, who inquired into the matter, and, finding it correct, dismissed Agrippa.

Again left destitute, we next find Agrippa proceeding to Ptolemais, now called Acre, where he was reduced to the greatest privations. He ordered his freedman Martias to use all his exertions to procure money, and he at length succeeded with one Peter or Protus, a freedman of his mother Berenice, who had been recommended by her in her last will to Antonia, and who had in consequence been taken by the latter into her service. Martias offered his bond for the money he wanted to borrow for his master, but Protus answered that Agrippa was already in his debt. Nevertheless he accepted a bond for 20,000 Attic drachms—the amount of which, according to one statement, is L.625 of our money, and, according to another, L.687, 10s.; but Martias gave Agrippa no more of the above sum than 17,500 drachms, retaining the remaining 2500, notwithstanding Agrippa's earnest entreaties to the contrary. Thus provided with funds he went to Anthedon, where he intended to embark for Italy, but he was intercepted

by a body of cavalry sent by Herennius Capito, the imperial procurator of Jamnia, who required him to pay a debt of 300,000 denarii which had been lent him from the public treasury when he was at Rome. Agrippa promised to satisfy the demands of Herennius, but he took advantage of the night, weighed anchor, and sailed for Alexandria.

When Agrippa arrived in that city, he found that his supply of money would not defray his expenses to Rome, or at least if it did that he would have little remaining, and as he did not wish to make his re-appearance in the imperial city in poverty, he entered into a negotiation with Alexander, the Alabarch, or chief of the Alexandrian Jews, to lend him 200,000 denarii. The Jewish Alabarch, however, who knew him well, refused to lend him the money on his own bond, but told him that he would accept the security of his wife Cypros, whom he had always admired for her virtue and attachment to her husband. This lady willingly acceded to the proposal, and Alexander gave Agrippa a portion of it, promising to remit the remainder to him at Puteoli in Italy, lest he would spend it too soon. With this sum he sailed for Rome, and arrived at Puteoli, where he wrote to the Emperor Tiberius, who was then at Capræa, requesting an audience. The Emperor answered him in a gracious manner, and told him that he would be welcome. Agrippa immediately proceeded to Capræa, where he was favourably received by Tiberius, and apartments were assigned to him in the palace.

But it happened on the very day after the arrival of Agrippa at the Emperor's insular retreat, that a letter was received from Herennius Capito, giving notice of the money he had borrowed from the treasury some time previously, which he had promised to pay at a certain date, and that he had shamefully absconded. This announcement greatly irritated the Emperor, who gave strict orders to the guards not to admit Agrippa to his presence till he had settled the debt due to

Herennius. Fortunately Antonia, the mother of Germanicus and Claudius, out of respect to the memory of his mother Berenice, enabled him to satisfy this demand, and he was again restored to the favour of Tiberius. The Emperor desired him to attend his grandson Tiberius Nero, but Agrippa attached himself to the well known Caius Caligula, who was the grandson of Antonia; and having about this time obtained from a Samaritan named Thallus, one of the Emperor's freedmen, a loan of a million of denarii, he repaid Antonia, and spent the rest in securing the friendship of Caligula.

Agrippa had now the fairest prospects of advancement. He was living on the most intimate terms with Caligula, who at this period of his life was of a mild and amiable disposition, and gave no indications of that atrocity of conduct which was afterwards to transmit his name to posterity as one of the most infamous tyrants. But Agrippa's courtly attachment to Caligula made him commit himself in a manner which in many cases would have been of the most fatal consequences to himself. He was one day riding in a chariot with Caligula, when he expressed a wish that Tiberius might soon leave the empire to him, in other words, that the Emperor might soon die. It was alleged that he said to Caligula, "Shall I never see the day in which the old man"—meaning the Emperor—"will depart to the other world, and leave this at the command of my Caius? His grandson Tiberius cannot prevent the succession, for it will be an easy matter to get rid of him. How prosperous would not then the whole earth become, and what a share I would have in its happiness!" These dangerous sentiments were overheard by the charioteer named Eutychus, who was one of Agrippa's own freedmen. This man hinted nothing of it at the time to any one, but being soon afterwards accused by Agrippa of robbery, he fled, and when apprehended, and carried before the Prefect at Rome, he

refused to answer any question concerning the particular crime of which he was accused, but declared he had something most important to communicate to the Emperor, which indeed concerned his life. The freedman was accordingly sent to Capræa, and committed to prison, where he remained a considerable time without being examined, it being only known generally that he accused his master of certain designs against the Emperor. Agrippa, who had probably forgotten his conversation with Caligula, was extremely uneasy at the charge, and at length, by the influence of Antonia, the freedman was admitted into the presence of Tiberius. The speech of Agrippa to Caligula was then reported to the Emperor, who was the more inclined to assign importance to it from the well known fact that he had attached himself most devotedly to Caligula, in preference to Tiberius Nero. Agrippa was immediately put in chains and sent to prison, where he remained in close confinement till the death of Tiberius, which happened some months afterwards. Josephus informs us, without adding the least intimation that he doubts the truth of the story, that, in the sixth month after Agrippa's arrest, as he was one day leaning against a tree, and standing among some prisoners, an owl rested on a branch above his head. A German prisoner, who affected to be a soothsayer, asked one of the guards who the individual was leaning against the tree, and was told that he was one of the most considerable men of the Jewish nation. He requested to converse with Agrippa, as if desirous to inquire into the peculiar manners and customs of the Jews, when he told him of the ominous bird which had perched above him, and assured him that he would soon be set at liberty and raised to the highest honours, but that when this bird appeared to him a second time he would not have five days to live. This prediction appeared ridiculous to Agrippa, who is said to have smiled at it with incredulity. There can be little doubt that this story was invented after Agrippa's extraordinary death.

Tiberius died in A.D. 38, and was succeeded by Caligula, whom he had been induced to nominate to the imperial throne contrary to his own inclinations. The severity of Agrippa's confinement was immediately relaxed, and in a few days he was admitted to the presence of the new Emperor, who, instead of the iron chain by which he had been fastened to a soldier, gave him a golden one of equal weight, placed a diadem on his head, and made him king or tetrarch of the greater part of Judea—including Gaulanitis, Batanea, Trachonitis, and Lysanias. In the second year of the reign of Caligula, Agrippa departed from Rome by way of Egypt, to take possession of his government. His previous vicissitudes and his sudden advancement excited considerable attention. Some could hardly believe that he who now returned with a crown, and who was the friend of the Emperor, was the same individual who had been obliged to leave his native country in poverty and misery; others admired his perseverance and resolution. Philo tells us that he was insulted at Alexandria, and beheld with astonishment in Judea. Agrippa's good fortune excited the envy of his sister Herodias, who urged her husband Herod Antipas to seek similar honours. She saw the man who had been unable to pay his debts appearing in royal robes, and surrounded by multitudes of professed admirers. Herod, who loved ease, and distrusted the imperial court, zealously endeavoured to resist her importunities, but he at last consented, and went with her to Rome. It is interesting to know that this Herodias is the person whose daughter danced before Herod, and whose request caused the decapitation of John the Baptist. Agrippa received information of the ambitious designs of Herod, and he sent his freedman Fortunatus to Italy with presents to the Emperor, and letters accusing Herod of holding secret communications with Artabanus, king of Parthia, to prove which it was alleged that he had collected arms for 70,000 men in his stores, and that he had also conspired with Sejanus against

the late Emperor Tiberius. Fortunatus arrived at Puteoli as soon as Herod, and instantly departed for Baïæ, a little town in Campania, where the Emperor was then residing. When Herod obtained an audience of Caligula, Fortunatus presented him with Agrippa's letters, who is said to have subsequently proceeded in person to Italy, that he might give more weight to his accusations. Caligula, startled at the accusation, asked Herod if he really had such a quantity of arms, and the latter was obliged to confess the fact. This admission was thought sufficient to prove the other charge. He was deposed from his tetrarchy, which, with all his property, was given to Agrippa, and he was banished to Lyons in France. The Emperor told Herodias that he pardoned her for the sake of her brother Agrippa, but she preferred accompanying her husband into exile, and sharing his misfortunes.

Caligula, who had now become an odious tyrant, sent Petronius into Judea with strict orders to place his statue in the Temple of Jerusalem, and to compel submission in case of resistance by force of arms. This order excited the utmost consternation among the Jews, many thousands of whom vowed to die rather than allow such a violation of their Law. Aristobulus and other leading men of the Jewish nation waited on Petronius at Tiberias, and entreated him to inform the Emperor of the state of affairs, which might induce him to recall his order. Agrippa was then at Rome, and had embraced an opportunity to present a petition in favour of the Jews, in consequence of which the Emperor had actually written to Petronius, commanding him not to set up the statue; but when he received that officer's letter he recalled his order, and sent a threatening answer, intimating that he was bribed by the Jews. The assassination of this odious tyrant, however, which occurred soon after, in A.D. 41, relieved the Jews from all farther apprehensions on this subject, as Petronius received notice of it before the arrival of the threat. Agrippa, in

conjunction with Antiochus, king of Commagena, is accused by a writer of inspiring Caligula with tyrannical principles, and the fact that he always retained the favour of that scourge of mankind seems to justify the supposition that he not only flattered him, but even praised his cruel actions and excused his enormities.

Caligula was assassinated in the fourth year of his reign, and Agrippa took a very important part in the affairs of Rome. The military called Claudius Drusus to the imperial throne, and Agrippa persuaded him to accept their proffers, at the same time inducing the senate to acknowledge him Emperor. It appears that the senate consulted the Jewish prince in the emergency, and were entirely guided by his advice. Claudius was not ungrateful for these services. He conferred on him the rank of consul, gave him Samaria, Abela, and a part of Libanus, and concluded an alliance with him in the Forum at Rome. Agrippa thus obtained the entire kingdom of his grandfather Herod the Great. The Emperor also published two edicts in favour of the Jews. In the one he restored to the Alexandrian Jews their ancient privileges, which had been confirmed by the great Augustus, and set at liberty their alabarch, Alexander, the early friend and procurator of the mother of Agrippa; and in the other he declared, that as his two particular friends Agrippa and Herod (now also recalled from exile) had desired him to grant to all the Jews throughout the empire the same privileges he had restored to those of Alexandria, he had complied with their request, not only to gratify the two illustrious persons who interceded for them, but because the Jews deserved this favour for their attachment and fidelity to the Romans. Claudius added in his edict, that while he indulged the Jews in this respect as a proof of his favour, they were on no account to despise the religion of other nations, but to live peaceably in the enjoyment of their own.

When Agrippa returned to Jerusalem in A.D. 42, he suspended the golden chain which he had received from Caligula near the treasury of the Temple, as a memorial of his deliverance. He also performed the vows he had made, and offered sacrifices, and presented thank-offerings on the altar. He then proceeded to exert some acts of sovereignty, such as relieving the citizens of Jerusalem from a tax on their houses, and changing or deposing the high priest. He undertook to strengthen and raise the walls of the new part of the city, but Marsus, the governor of Syria, obtained an edict from Claudius to prevent it, by representing the design as dangerous to the Roman power, and Agrippa was obliged to comply. He spent considerable sums, however, in adorning several cities, particularly Berytus, where he built a theatre, an amphitheatre, a portico, and several baths, and he instituted games, and exhibitions after the Roman manner, which by no means gave satisfaction to the Jews, who regarded such representations with great discontentment. Nevertheless Agrippa was extremely popular among his subjects. He was sincerely attached to the Mosaic Law and ritual, made Jerusalem the place of his chief residence, and observed strictly the ancient custom of the Jews of daily offering sacrifices in the Temple. He is represented by Josephus as being naturally generous, benevolent, and entertaining a sincere regard for his people, evincing kindness towards strangers, and liberally relieving the miserable and the afflicted. He was also held in great esteem by the neighbouring petty sovereigns, to whom on one occasion he gave a series of grand entertainments at Tiberias; but Marsus, who suspected that mischief might occur from the intercourse of so many influential persons, procured an imperial edict commanding them to depart to their respective states. It is said that this greatly exasperated Agrippa against Marsus, and he often importuned Claudius to remove him from the government of Syria, but without effect.

In the third year of Agrippa's reign

over all Judea, in A.D. 44, he caused the Apostle St James, the son of Zebedee and brother of St John, to be beheaded, and he imprisoned St Peter. He was prompted to these measures as much by his desire of popularity, as by his zeal for the Jewish religion. Soon afterwards he went to Cæsarea to celebrate games in honour of the Emperor, and here he died in the remarkable manner described in the Acts of the Apostles. On the second day of the games Agrippa went early in the morning to the theatre, dressed in a sumptuous robe so artfully wrought with silver, that when the sun shone upon it a strong light was reflected, which easily excited the superstitious veneration of the Tyrians and Sidonians whom he addressed. At the conclusion of his oration the multitude saluted him as a god, according to the custom of that period, as we find specially exemplified in the case of the Roman Emperors, who caused divine honours to be paid to their statues. Agrippa, instead of repelling and punishing their impious flattery, was pleased with it; but suddenly the "angel of the Lord struck him because he did not give glory unto God," and the inspired historian informs us that he was gnawed by worms, and "gave up the ghost"—a monument of the Divine displeasure, and a warning to all future princes to guard against the insinuations of flatterers, and to remember at all times that the God of Heaven is "King of kings and Lord of lords." Agrippa died on the fifth day after the attack, in the fifty-fourth year of his age, and the seventh from the commencement of his reign, at the close of the third year when Claudius had appointed him king over all Judea.

Josephus relates the manner of Agrippa's death differently from St Luke, but he concurs with the inspired historian in the statement that the disease of the intestines with which he was attacked was a Divine judgment. He tells us that while the king received the impious flattery with evident gratification, he perceived an owl perched upon a rope

over his head, and immediately concluded, according to the prediction of the German soothsayer, that his death was near. When he felt his pain increase he was carried to his palace, and when it was reported that he was dying, the people appeared in sackcloth, and offered prayers to God for his recovery. His death was sincerely lamented by his Jewish subjects, but the Greeks of Samaria testified their joy at it in the most outrageous manner, celebrating it by feasting, and heaping every possible indignity on his memory, from which it appears that he had oppressed them with severity.

AGRIPPA II., celebrated in the Acts of the Apostles as the prince before whom St Paul defended himself at Cæsarea, and who was "almost persuaded to be a Christian," was the son of the preceding, and the last king of the family of Herod the Great. He was at Rome when his father died, and was then only seventeen years of age. Claudius was at first inclined to place him on his father's throne, but the representations of his friends, who demonstrated to him that it required a man of consummate wisdom and prudence to keep Judea in peace, made him defer his intention for a time, and he united Judea to Syria, appointing Cassius Longinus to be prefect of the province in the room of Marsus, and at the same time sending Cuspius Fadus as Procurator. The latter officer was authorized to punish severely the Greek inhabitants of Cæsarea and Samaria for the disorders they had committed at the death of the elder Agrippa, to send the five cohorts of soldiers stationed there to Pontus, and to supply their place with other troops, but those troops sent a deputy to Claudius, and obtained permission to remain in the country. It is interesting to know that these were the soldiers whose conduct afterwards occasioned the Jewish War and the destruction of Jerusalem foretold by our Saviour, at this time rapidly approaching.

Though the young Agrippa had no authority he appears to have been a fa-

vourite with the Emperor, and he exerted his influence in behalf of the Jews, to whom on one occasion he rendered an important service. Cuspius Fadus had summoned the priests and principal inhabitants of Jerusalem, and commanded them in the name of the Emperor to deposit the pontifical robes of the high priests in the fortress of Antonia, then held by the Romans, and he had marched some troops into the city under the command of Longinus to preserve order if any disturbance ensued. The priests, who knew the danger they incurred if they refused to obey the imperial mandate, earnestly requested Fadus and Longinus to delay till they represented the case to the Emperor, and obtained his answer. Those officers complied on the condition of giving hostages till the ambassadors returned, to which the Jews consented. When the ambassadors arrived at Rome they were introduced by Agrippa to Claudius, who told them that he would revoke his edict only for the sake of Agrippa, on whose sole account he would bestow upon them the favour they desired. The Emperor also wrote a letter to the magistrates and people of Jerusalem, which, as given by Josephus, does him great honour. "Your deputies," he informs them, "were introduced to me by Agrippa, who has been educated with me, and for whom I have a great regard. They returned me thanks for the care I take of your nation, and earnestly entreated that I would give you permission to keep the pontifical ornaments of your high priests, as Vitellius has done. I have granted their request not only from motives of piety, but because I think it is just and reasonable that every one should have liberty to follow the religion of his country." This was the policy which the ancient Romans followed in their foreign wars. They never interfered with the religious rites of the countries they conquered, unless they considered those rites inconsistent with the preservation of order, and hence we find no religious animosities operating in their contests.

Agrippa, who had succeeded his uncle Herod as king of Chalcidias, was removed from that government by Claudius, who gave him the provinces of Batanea and Trachonitis, which his grand-uncle Philip the Tetrarch had enjoyed, and also the province of Abela, which belonged to the tetrarchate of Lysanias. Having received these honours from the Emperor, he now attended to his family affairs. He gave his sister Drusilla in marriage to the petty king of Emesa, who had submitted to the rite of circumcision to obtain her. She had been previously promised to Epiphanes, the son of king Antiochus, who had pledged himself that he would become a Jew, but he broke his promise, and the match was broken off. But Drusilla's marriage with the king of Emesa was soon dissolved, for Felix became attached to her, though he had two wives if we are to credit Suetonius; and through the agency of one Simon, a professed sorcerer, he made her offers of marriage and was accepted. Mariamne, another sister of Agrippa, was married to Archelaus, to whom she had been betrothed by her father. Bernice, his eldest sister, had been married to her uncle Herod, and after his death had remained a widow, but as reports were circulated against her in reference to her brother, she proposed to marry Polemon, king of Cilicia, if he would embrace the Jewish religion, in the hope that this would show the injustice of the accusations against her. Polemon accepted the proposal, as Bernice was very rich, but they soon separated on account of her licentious conduct, and as soon as she abandoned him he renounced the religion he had professed. Agrippa's other sisters conducted themselves in a similarly disreputable manner. Drusilla has already been noticed. Mariamne left her husband Archelaus, and married one of the richest Jews of Alexandria, by whom she had a son named Agrippinus.

Nero, the imperial successor of Claudius, considerably enlarged Agrippa's kingdom by adding four cities to it, with their surrounding territories, namely,

Tiberias and Tarichæa, and, beyond the Jordan, Abela and Julias. A few years afterwards, while Festus was Procurator of Judea, Agrippa occasioned a serious excitement in Jerusalem by building a high apartment in the palace of Herod near the gymnasium, which afforded a fine view of the city, and enabled him to see whatever was transacted in the Temple. This gave great offence to the Jews, because their ritual prohibited any one to observe what was done in the Temple, especially when the sacrifices were offered. They accordingly built a high wall on the western side of the Temple, which entirely intercepted the view of the interior from Agrippa's apartment, and also from the western portico. Agrippa ordered the wall to be pulled down, and he was supported by Festus, but the Jews requested permission to send deputies to Rome, and lay the whole affair before Nero. This was granted, and twelve of the principal men of Jerusalem were sent to Rome, among whom were Ismael, the high priest, and Helkias, keeper of the sacred treasure. The Emperor, at the instance of his wife Poppæa, allowed the wall to stand to the mortification of Agrippa, but he detained Ismael and Helkias as hostages for the fidelity of the Jews, and allowed the other ten deputies to return to Jerusalem.

One of the persons whom Agrippa made high priest was named Ananus, whose father, of the same name, and four brothers, had all held the office. He was a harsh and determined Sadducee, and very severe in his punishments. Among his first acts he assembled the sanhedrin, and brought before them James, who was commonly called the brother of our Saviour, and some others, and after finding them guilty of transgressing the Law, he delivered them to be stoned. Josephus, who narrates this circumstance, informs us that many of the better order of the citizens disapproved of this measure, and sent a private message to Agrippa, requesting him to write to Ananus, and restrain his arbitrary and unjustifiable conduct. Others went to

meet the new procurator Albinus, who had arrived at Alexandria, and informed him that it was illegal for the high priest to hold a criminal court without his consent. The Roman functionary wrote an angry letter to Ananus, threatening him with summary punishment, but Agrippa deposed him in the third month of his elevation.

Judea was at this time in a fearful state of disorder, the certain result of bad government. False Messiahs, false prophets, impostors, and magicians, deluded the people by promises of great events, and bands of robbers and assassins abounded throughout the country. Yet, notwithstanding this wretched state of affairs, Agrippa adorned Cæsarea-Philippi, in his own kingdom, with many fine buildings, and called the city *Neronias*, in honour of the Emperor. He instituted games at Berytus, and ornamented that place with statues and paintings, to the great dissatisfaction of the Jews. The singers among the Levites received permission from him to wear linen robes—a privilege which the Law allowed only to the priests, and another class of Levites who were employed in the inferior services of the Temple obtained the same distinction. He at this time employed some thousands of labourers, who had been employed in completing the apartments of the Temple, to pave the streets of Jerusalem with white stone.

In A.D. 66 began the memorable Jewish war predicted by our Saviour. The ostensible origin of it was the bad government of the Roman procurators, especially of Florus, who had been appointed to that office in A.D. 65, whose conduct was worse than that of any of his predecessors. Agrippa, who knew what would be the inevitable consequences of such a war, used every endeavour to persuade the Jews against it, but they replied that it was neither against the Romans nor against the Emperor that they had resolved to make war, but against Florus, whose intolerable tyranny they could no longer endure. Agrippa, however, told them that their actions plainly

indicated that they were determined to revolt against the Romans, for they had refused to pay their taxes, and had pulled down the gallery which was between the Temple and the fort Antonia, where the Prætorian Guard were usually stationed. He advised them, if they wished to show that they did not intend to revolt, to pay their taxes and to repair the fort, as it was to the Emperor the money was due, and as the fort belonged to him, and not to Florus. He showed them that complaints and murmurs are seldom the right methods to propitiate exasperated governors, for when they are reproached with minor faults they are provoked to be more severe. He represented to them that, as their governors did not hold their places for life, they might hope for redress when a new one was appointed, and that they should wait patiently till such change occurred. He desired the Jews to consider that it was impossible for them to carry on a successful war against the Romans, to whom the most valiant nations had been compelled to submit. In short, if Agrippa is correctly reported by Josephus, he enforces passive obedience with considerable eloquence, nor does he forget to adduce some motives borrowed from religion. "Only consider," said he, "that, even though you were more powerful than your enemies, you cannot expect success against them, for if you observe the Sabbath religiously you must be vanquished on those days, as your ancestors were by Pompey, who always chose to make his attacks on a day when he knew the Jews would not defend themselves; and if you do not scruple to infringe the Law by fighting on the Sabbath, how can you pretend that you take up arms solely to maintain your laws and religion? Can you hope for God's favour at the time you are provoking Him, by voluntarily disobeying his commandments?" After representing the miserable condition to which the Romans would reduce the city of Jerusalem, and that they would put the whole nation to the sword as an example to deter others from resisting the Roman power,

he finished his address by declaring solemnly that his sole object was to save the nation, and that it was yet time to avoid those dangers to which they would most certainly be exposed.

But this speech had a different effect on those who heard it from what Agrippa anticipated, for it not only exasperated them, but some even threw stones at him, and he was driven out of the city amid the most opprobrious language. Finding it impossible to restrain their rage, Agrippa complained bitterly of their usage, and retired to his own kingdom. Some of the principal citizens, after doing every thing in their power to repress the revolt, sent to Agrippa and Florus, requesting them to come to Jerusalem with a body of troops, and restore peace before the rebellion proceeded farther. Florus, who rejoiced at the revolt, returned no answer to the message; but Agrippa sent three thousand soldiers, who, however, were unable to quell the insurrection, which terminated in the total overthrow of the Jewish nation, and in the destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem.

During the whole Jewish War, Agrippa, though a Jew by birth and by religion, devoted himself entirely to the interests of the Romans, whose assistance he indeed required to secure the peace of his own territories when the inhabitants of Tiberias and Tarichea revolted. He was wounded in the arm by a stone when in the act of exhorting the citizens of Gamala to surrender, which greatly exasperated the Roman soldiers, with whom Agrippa was very popular, and who inferred from this that if the Jews would not spare a king of their own nation and religion they must be much more cruel to strangers. Little is known of Agrippa's subsequent history. It is probable that he retired to Rome after the total subjugation and dispersion of the Jews, as he died in the imperial city in the third year of the reign of Trajan, A.D. 100.

Agrippa is prominently introduced in the Evangelical narrative by his memorable declaration to St Paul, "Almost

thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Festus, the governor, was present, who expected that the Jews would accuse St Paul of crimes of a very different nature from those they brought forward against him. When, however, he heard that the question related exclusively to their religion he despised the whole affair. The accusation referred "to Jesus, which was dead, and Paul affirmed to be living." It is evident that Agrippa knew little of our Saviour's history and of the Christian religion, which shows that it had not then made any considerable progress; and it was not till after the destruction of Jerusalem that the gospel was extensively preached by the Apostles among the Gentiles. Till that great event the Christians did not separate from the Jews, but apparently kept the feasts and observed the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law. This may be the reason why both Agrippa and Festus were so little acquainted with Christianity. St Paul treated Agrippa with great respect, and complimented him on his knowledge of the ancient Prophets; and in his answer to Festus, whom he addressed in the most courteous manner, he says, "The king knows these things, for I am persuaded that none of these things are hidden from him."

AHAB, king of Israel, succeeded his father Omri, the fifth king of the Ten Tribes, B.C. 918. He surpassed all his predecessors in wickedness and impiety, being entirely under the control of his queen Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, or Ithobalus, king of Tyre. Hitherto the golden calves had been the sole objects of idolatrous worship, but Ahab and Jezebel united their authority to introduce the idols of other nations, particularly the worship of Baal, the celebrated idol of the Sidonians. It ought to be here observed, that this marriage of Ahab aggravated his other crimes. Some of his predecessors had indeed married what are called "strange women," but they had previously compelled them to pass through some formalities, and to embrace the Jewish religion. But Ahab

imposed no such obligation upon Jezebel, whose cruel, impious, and haughty disposition has made her name proverbial. The idolatry of Ahab was without limits, and every vice was rewarded and honoured by his queen. He built a temple at Samaria to Baal, and consecrated a grove to the idol; and it appeared as if the knowledge of the true God was lost for ever to the Ten Tribes. Jezebel supported four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal, and four hundred prophets of the groves, and the maintenance of such a number of these impostors is a strong proof of her zealous attachment to idolatry.

The crimes of Ahab at length brought against him the Divine vengeance, and the Prophet Elijah was sent to inform him that "the land would not be watered with rain or dew for three years." When he had announced this severe judgment, which was particularly so in such a country, he hastily departed, lest Ahab or Jezebel should put him to death. This drought continued three years, as the Prophet had foretold, and it appears to have been known to some of the Pagan writers, for Menander the historian, quoted by Josephus against Apion, mentions Ithobalus, king of Tyre, in whose reign there was a "prodigious drought in the country, but upon his humble prayer to God an exceeding storm of thunder followed." Alarmed at the continuance of the drought Ahab sent Obadiah, the governor of his household—a man who professed the true religion, and had signalized himself by preserving a hundred prophets—to explore the country for wells and pasturage, lest all the cattle should perish. Obadiah was met by Elijah, who ordered him to return and inform Ahab that he demanded a personal interview with him. The governor, who well knew the hatred which both Ahab and Jezebel cherished towards the Prophet, and the repeated attempts they had made to apprehend him, would gladly have avoided being the bearer of the message, and was only reconciled to it by being assured that it was a Divine

arrangement, and pregnant with the most momentous consequences. In the interview which followed Ahab reproached Elijah in strong terms as the troubler of Israel, to which the Prophet retorted with equal severity, and ordered him to assemble all the people at Mount Carmel on the Mediterranean, together with the prophets of Baal and the prophets of the groves. Here occurred that remarkable sacrifice which terminated in the slaughter of the false prophets at the neighbouring river of Kishon, which falls into the Bay of Acre at the foot of the Mount. After this rain was obtained from God, and the earth was restored to its wonted fertility. The transaction now alluded to is fully narrated in the account of Elijah. It appears that the "prophets of the groves" did not follow those of Baal to Mount Carmel, but the reason is not intimated by the sacred historian.

About six years after this event Benhadad, king of Syria, invaded Ahab's kingdom and besieged Samaria. He was attended by "thirty-two kings," or petty princes of Syria and Arabia, corresponding to the sheiks of the present day, who were either tributaries or auxiliaries, for in those countries most of the cities were governed by their own kings in early times. Benhadad sent a message to Ahab, who was in the greatest alarm and anxiety, intimating that his wives, his children, and all his valuable property, belonged of right to him, and Ahab in reply acknowledged himself to be the vassal of the king of Syria, willing to pay the tribute which might be exacted from him, and placing himself under his protection. Benhadad, however, could pretend to no other right to the kingdom and property of Ahab than what his superior force might secure for him, and as such the king of Israel admitted his claim, in the hope of obtaining moderate and easy conditions in the payment of tribute, or in the negotiation of peace by some considerable present. This is evident from the subsequent transactions; for when Benhadad sent again requiring, Ahab to deliver up

on the following day whatsoever the Syrian deputies should select after a minute search, thus claiming a right to dispose absolutely of the lives and property of the king of Israel and his subjects, as if they were his own, a council was called, and it was resolved to pay no attention to the demand. When Benhadad was informed of this determination, he expressed his resentment in strong language. "The gods do so unto me, and more also," he exclaimed, "if the dust of Samaria shall suffice for handfuls for all the people that follow me." In this hyperbole he intimated his resolution to destroy Samaria so effectually that he would not leave a handful of earth in it, in the same manner as Ezekiel predicted the total destruction of Tyre—"I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock;" but Josephus represents him as threatening that he could easily raise terraces and embankments higher than the walls of Samaria, though every one of his numerous soldiers should only take a handful of earth for the purpose. While Ahab was in this emergency, exposed to the insolent demands of the Syrian invader, and besieged in his capital, a Prophet was sent to inform him that his enemies would be completely discomfited by the "young men of the princes of the provinces."

It is not ascertained who those "young men" were, or what were their precise situations and employment. In the marginal reading of our version they are designated *servants*, and the Hebrew signifies either the *sons* or the *servants* of the princes of the provinces. In the Vulgate they are designated *footmen*, and Josephus calls them the sons of the governors. Others represent them as the sons of the king's chief officers; and others, again, contend that they were merely the servants of those persons. It is evident, however, that they were a body of individuals without experience, and on that account they were selected by God to be the instruments of overthrowing the proud Syrian.

Benhadad was carousing in his tent

with the petty kings who accompanied him when the young men assaulted his camp, followed and supported by Ahab's soldiers. The Syrians were put to flight, a great slaughter ensued, and Benhadad himself escaped with considerable difficulty on horseback. The same Prophet was sent again to Ahab to inform him that the Syrians would return the following year, and advised him to prepare for the invasion. Benhadad returned as the Prophet had announced, and encamped at Aphek, in the plains of Galilee and cantonment of Asher. He was induced to undertake this expedition by the representations of his advisers, who told him that the soldiers of Ahab had gained the former battle because their "gods" were "gods of the hills," therefore, they asserted, "they were stronger than we, but let us fight against them in the plain, and surely we shall be stronger than they;" and he was recommended to substitute chosen warriors for the tributary kings, and take the field with an army the same as that which he had lost.

This advice to Benhadad, which he eagerly adopted, reminds us of some curious superstitious notions which prevailed in ancient times. It was believed that the world was divided among different deities, who severally presided over certain places, localities, and peculiar districts. Every people, country, and city had particular deities; and mountains, woods, seas, rivers, and springs were believed to be specially under some supernatural protecting power. We read of several nations who worshipped mountains—not the visible mass, but the deity who was supposed to inhabit them. Many instances might be produced from ancient history illustrative of this fact, and it is evident that the Syrians really thought that the gods worshipped at Samaria defended the mountain on which the city was built. This opinion might be farther confirmed by the circumstance that the Temple of Jehovah, and the most ancient and considerable of his altars, were placed on hills, where the proper worship was rendered. The Law had been given

from Mount Sinai, and published upon Ebal and Gerizim; and the stupendous miracle which had been manifested on Mount Carmel a few years before Benhadad's invasion, when the priests of Baal were put to death, was well known over the whole country, as it was traditionally remembered centuries afterwards. It invested that rocky promontory of the Mediterranean with peculiar awe, for even Tacitus informs us that Carmel, which he says lies between Judea and Syria, is the name of a mountain and a deity, and Suetonius records that Vespasian sacrificed there at the commencement of the Jewish War. Besides this superstition respecting the imaginary deities of hills, the Syrians might be induced to select a plain, that their chariots and cavalry might act with advantage against the enemy.

But Benhadad was again routed, and no fewer than one hundred thousand of his army fell. The fugitives, among whom was the king of Syria himself, took refuge in Aphek, where some thousands of them were killed by the fall of a wall. As Benhadad was now reduced to the greatest distress he had recourse to Ahab's clemency, who concluded an alliance with him on apparently favourable terms, which provoked God's severe displeasure. One of the sons of the Prophets, who according to Josephus and other writers was Micaiah, was sent to him, who procured himself to be wounded by the Divine command in a remarkable manner, and in this condition, with his face covered, he presented himself before Ahab. The appeal which he made to the king was in the form of a story. He feigned that he had been a soldier in the late battle, and that a certain officer had entrusted him with the custody of a prisoner of note, whom he was charged to hold safe under penalty of death or a severe fine; but that, becoming interested in the pursuit of the enemy, he had unfortunately allowed his prisoner to escape, and that he was likely to undergo one or other of the penalties. The king told him that it was no more than he deserved for

his carelessness and imprudence. All this was evidently said to draw Ahab's condemnation from his own mouth, as Nathan did to David; and when he divested himself of his disguise, he was immediately recognized by the king. "Thus saith the Lord," he informed Ahab, "Because thou hast let go out of thy hand a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people." This announcement startled Ahab, and he retired to his palace in Samaria in great distress. His clemency was doubtless exercised for selfish purposes, for it does not appear that he was in other respects a man of the least humanity.

On the following year Ahab involved himself in a crime of a most atrocious description, which he in some measure sanctioned by the apathy he exhibited after it was committed. He cast his covetous eyes on a vineyard belonging to Naboth, which lay near his country palace at Jezreel, the residence of his queen Jezebel, and it was probably at her instigation that he offered to purchase it from Naboth, or to assign him what he described as a better property than the one in question. It is appropriately observed by Bishop Patrick, that the account of Ahab coveting Naboth's vineyard is immediately placed after his treatment of Benhadad, to show his wickedness in sparing him and killing Naboth, for it was a great aggravation of his crime that he basely murdered a just Israelite, and allowed an impious and idolatrous enemy to escape. Naboth, however, resisted all his offers, and positively refused to part with the inheritance of his ancestors on any account. He was supported in this resolution, to which he was doubtless prompted by family associations, by the Law of Moses, which expressly declared that "the land should not be sold for ever," and the Law was still in force, notwithstanding the depravity of the times. He was not in necessitous circumstances, which was the only case in which the Law permitted the sale

of an inheritance, Lev. xxv. 25. Naboth also foresaw that if he once sold his vineyard to the king he would have little chance of recovering it, not even at the Jubilee, which in such a profligate reign as that of Ahab was not likely to be observed in the manner enjoined at its institution, or under upright and religious princes.

Naboth's refusal to sell or exchange the inheritance of his fathers excited in the king the bitterest feelings of disappointment, and his health began in consequence to be affected. When Jezebel ascertained the cause she told him to refrain from farther uneasiness, as she would put him in possession of the desired property. She sent letters sealed with the royal seal, which was necessary to give validity to such an order, to the elders of Jezreel, accusing Naboth of blasphemy against God and the king, and commanding them to put him to death. These orders were duly executed, and Ahab proceeded to Jezreel to secure the vineyard. It appears from this and another transaction (2 Sam. xvi. 4) that in the kingdom of Israel, as in most other countries, the estates of persons convicted of offences against the state were forfeited to the king, for the landed property of the Hebrews was to a certain extent unalienable, which must have rendered it difficult for the kings to acquire extensive estates by purchase or other fair means. The temptation to charge persons with treason for the sake of succeeding to their property must have been considerable. All this is clearly intimated in the difficulty Ahab encountered in obtaining Naboth's vineyard, which all his influence and authority as king could not overcome.

As Ahab returned from Jezreel to Samaria he met the Prophet Elijah, who assured him that because he had "killed and taken possession," Jehovah would visit him and his family with the most appalling judgments—that he and Jezebel would both die violent deaths, attended with all the circumstances of wretchedness and infamy—and that "in the place

where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, dogs would lick his blood." This declaration so terrified him that he began to show some signs of repentance, which was sincere at the time, though transitory and imperfect, and it procured him an exemption from that part of the punishment denounced against himself. He was informed that all the evils would not be inflicted in his time, but in that of his son.

Two years afterwards we find Ahab engaged in a war with his former enemy Benhadad to recover Ramoth-Gilead, in which he solicited Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, to join him. The latter complied, but desired that God might be consulted with respect to the result of the intended movement. Ahab assembled four hundred prophets, who are conjectured by Calmet to be the "prophets of the groves" who did not go to Mount Carmel with those of Baal, and they all promised him the most certain success; but Jehoshaphat was not satisfied, and requested him to consult a "prophet of the Lord"—a true prophet, to which he consented with great reluctance. Micaiah was summoned, against whom Ahab cherished a particular resentment, because he never predicted any thing good concerning him. Micaiah at first seemed to intimate success also, but being commanded to declare the truth, he announced the complete defeat of Ahab's troops and the death of the king himself. Enraged at this freedom, the king, who, like other tyrants, could not endure to hear the truth unless it agreed with his own interest or pleasure, ordered the prophet to be confined, and treated with the utmost severity until he returned. The two kings then marched to the siege of Ramoth-Gilead. Ahab persuaded Jehoshaphat to appear in his usual robes, while he disguised himself, being aware that Benhadad had issued an express order to his army to fight only against the king of Israel. The dress of Jehoshaphat at first deceived the Syrian soldiers, who took him for Ahab, and

attacked him, but they discovered their mistake, and desisted from pressing on the king of Judah's retreat. Meanwhile Ahab had been severely wounded by an arrow, and he ordered his charioteer to drive him out of the scene of battle. The wound proved mortal, for he died in the evening, and was carried to Samaria, where he was buried. His chariot and armour were washed in the pool of Samaria, and the dogs literally licked the clotted and gory blood which had issued from his wound, as God had announced by the Prophet Elijah. Thus died Ahab, in the twenty-second year of his reign, whose life, influenced by his queen Jezebel, seems to have been a continued scene of wickedness and impiety, and whom Elijah might well designate the "troubler of Israel."

AHAB, the name of one of the false prophets who seduced the Hebrews at Babylon, and who was threatened by Jeremiah to be delivered up to Nebuchadnezzar to be put to death (xxix. 21, 22). The Rabbins allege that this and the other false prophet were the two elders mentioned in the story of Susanna.

AHASUERUS, king of Persia, the ruler over "one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, and who married Esther, and promoted her to be queen, has occasioned considerable discussion to ascertain the Persian monarch with whom he ought to be identified. Archbishop Usher contends for Darius the son of Hystaspes, Scaliger for Xerxes, whose queen was called Amestris, and Dr Prideaux connects him with Artaxerxes Longimanus, in which he is supported by Josephus, the Septuagint, and the Greek additions to the Book of Esther, in which Ahasuerus is termed Artaxerxes, and is known to have cherished the most friendly feelings towards the Jews. This latter supposition is that which has obtained the greatest number of supporters, and there are many strong presumptive circumstances in its favour.

The name *Ahasuerus* literally signifies *king, head, or chief*. It is also writ-

ten, *Achashverosh*, and occurs in the Book of Ezra (iv. 6), where Cambyses seems to be meant by it, and in the Prophecy of Daniel (ix. 1), where some interpreters think it indicates Astyages, king of the Medes. The signification of the name evidently explains the reason of its being given to several monarchs.

Artaxerxes Longimanus, who is the reputed Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther, commenced his reign B.C. 465, and is said to have occupied the Persian throne forty-two years. He is called Ardisheer Dirazdüst, otherwise Bah-man, in the Persian annals, and is celebrated for the wisdom of his government, and for his accurate knowledge of the internal state of the numerous provinces which composed his Empire. He is said to have extended his conquests to the west, and to have deposed the son of Buchtul-Nasser (Belshazzar, the descendant of Nebuchadnezzar) from the government of Babylon. The prince received his designation of Longimanus (in Persian *Dirazdüst*) on account of his long arms, and his other name *Bah-man* is also a Sanscrit compound signifying *possessing arms*. The Persian poet Firdewsi says of him, "When he stood on his feet, the ends of the fingers of his hand reached below his knee," and this description corresponds with the notices of him by Greek authors. Sir John Malcolm informs us, on the authority of the Persian historians, that "under him the Jews were treated with kindness, and had the privilege granted them of being governed by a ruler of their own nation: it is added that these favours to the Jews were by the express orders of Bah-man, whose favourite lady was of the Jewish nation." The distinguished historian of Persia inserts a note in another place to this effect—"Artaxerxes is mentioned in Scripture under the name of Ahasuerus, which was probably a title like *Khoosroo*, as it is given to several Persian kings. He is believed to be the monarch who married Esther, and he became, in consequence of his love to her, and the services rendered to him by her uncle

Mordecai, the powerful friend and protector of the Jews. This account is supported by several Mahometan authors, who affirm the fact of the kindness of this king to the Jews, and state as a reason that one of his favourite ladies was of that race." Nevertheless the whole subject is so involved, obscure, and difficult, that it is almost impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion. The following remarks of Sir John Malcolm amply illustrate the force of this observation. "The historical facts recorded in Scripture relative to the ancient kings of Assyria and Persia are not numerous, and may be termed incidental. The prophecies regarding these monarchs and the nations they governed are more frequent. From the two combined, commentators have written volumes to explain this part of the ancient history of the world; but the dates of sacred history are still a subject upon which the learned are far from agreed, and it would be impossible, even if these were fixed beyond dispute, to ground any conclusion upon their coincidence with Grecian or Persian histories, till we had determined that the latter had equal claim to our credit. There cannot, therefore, be an attempt more arduous than that of the chronologist, who endeavours to elucidate the dates and events of this early period of Oriental history. The chronology of Scripture is unsatisfactory from the scantiness of facts, the confusion of dates, the errors arising from the writing of proper names in different languages, and the variety of appellations often used to designate the same person. The profane history of this era, which professes to be more particular, and which affords us long catalogues of kings, and a series of their actions, though delightful when we read it for amusement, is found on examination to be so involved in fable, and so perplexed by contradictory accounts, that we can hardly permit our minds to be convinced of more than the certainty of a few important facts, which prove the existence of particular kings, and the occurrence of some great revo-

lutions in the monarchies of Assyria and Persia."

On the other hand, Professor Jahn informs us that, from various circumstances it appears very probable that both the Artaxerxes of Ezra, who is mentioned next after Darius Hystarpes, and the Ahasuerus of Esther, are names of Xerxes the First. The following are the reasons which induce him to adopt this conclusion, and they are here quoted to show the difficulty which attends every investigation of this obscure period of Oriental history.—"It is not improbable that this king, who in the seventh year of his reign had made Mordecai the Jew his prime minister, and Esther the Jewess his queen, should give to Ezra the Jew a commission conferring such full powers as we find vested in Ezra. Xerxes might hope that, by thus patronizing the Jews, he would obtain some favour, after his unsuccessful campaigns, from the God of heaven, whom the Jews worshipped, and to whom Cyrus attributed all his victories. Thus much seems to be indicated by the words of the edict (Ezra vii. 23). The commission of Ezra was given in the seventh year of the king, after the retreat from Greece. It is no objection to our hypothesis that Ezra began his journey on the first day of the first month, and arrived at Jerusalem on the first of the fifth month, in the second year of Artaxerxes, while Esther is said to have been declared queen in the tenth month of this year, for the Book of Esther computes the months from harvest, or Tishri, while Ezra reckons from spring, or Nisan. Moreover, the favour of the king towards the Jews did not commence with the elevation of Esther to the throne, for before this time Mordecai had a place among the nobles of the court in the palace, and consequently he must have been one of the royal officers. The difference of the names Artaxerxes, Xerxes, and Ahasuerus, need occasion no difficulty, for these are not so much proper names as appellatives applied to every king at pleasure. Thus, Daniel calls even Astyages *Ahasuerus of the Median line.*"

Mr Horne advances a very ingenious conjecture respecting the Book of Esther—that the whole, with some explanations and adaptations, was extracted from the Persian annals by Ezra, Nehemiah, or Mordecai. This will certainly account for many peculiarities throughout the Book, such as the omission of the Divine name—for various parenthetical explanations which appear to have been considered necessary for a Jewish reader—and for the numerous particulars introduced concerning the court of the Persian king, his empire, and his government while nothing is introduced which is strictly peculiar to the Jews except the genealogy of Mordecai. These inferences appear to be warranted by a direct allusion to the source of information—"the Book of the chronicles of the kings of Persia and Media," *Esth.* x. 2. The history extends in the strict sense from the third to the twelfth year of Artaxerxes, but the whole estimate of the time which the Book embraces is much more comprehensive, and is variously stated from ten or eleven to eighteen or twenty years. The transactions took place at Shushan, or Susa, one of the select residences of the Persian kings.

The Book of Esther contains so many allusions to the customs of the Persians, that to illustrate them all would occupy too much space in the present work. Some few particulars, however, must not be omitted. The Book opens with an account of a feast given by Ahasuerus to "all his princes and his servants, whom he showed the riches of his glorious kingdom and the honour of his excellent majesty many days, even an hundred and fourscore days." This sumptuous and extended entertainment was succeeded by one to "all the people, small and great," who were present in the palace, and it lasted seven days. It was given in the "court of the garden of the king's palace," and was conducted in a like splendid style of Oriental magnificence. The ancient palaces of Persia, if any opinion can be derived from their ruins, and from the analogy of those of

modern times in that country, appear to have consisted of a number of distinct buildings situated in adjoining courts or gardens, the king's proper residence, or harem, being the innermost edifice, while at stated times, almost daily, he gave audience to, and received the homage of, the princes and nobles of his empire, and transacted public business. In this hall or vestibule, which some travellers have argued had no roof, the sumptuous feasts of Ahasuerus were held, and the distance of the pillars from each other, and the apparent absence of walls, with many other circumstances, apparently justify the conclusion that it had no roof. It was probably covered with an awning, and enclosed with magnificent curtains, which would give it the appearance of a splendid Oriental tent. This corresponds with what is said of the feast being held "in the court of the garden of the king's palace, where were white, green, and blue hangings, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble; the beds (or couches on which the guests reclined) were of gold and silver, upon a pavement of red, and blue, and white, and black marble." It is clear from this statement that the entertainment was not given in the palace, nor in any building, but in the court of the palace-garden, in a sort of tent supported on pillars, which is still used in Persia on great festivals, and in India. Mr Forbes mentions a large canopy spread on lofty pillars in the gardens and courts of the Mogul princes, attached by cords of various colours, some of which were most expensive and capacious; one is mentioned which cost 10,000 rupees, and of such magnitude as to cover 10,000 persons.

Another peculiarity in the feast given by Ahasuerus is the "royal wine," drunk in abundance from costly vessels of gold, yet "the drinking was according to law, none did compel, for so the king had appointed to all the officers of his house that they should do according to every man's pleasure." While all this feasting was in progress in the tent-palace, Vashti

the queen also held an entertainment, but it was *in the palace*, and this is in unison with existing Oriental usages, which oblige women to feast separately from the men on the same joyful occasions. On the seventh day of the royal feast Ahasuerus commanded his seven chamberlains or eunuchs to summon the Queen Vashti to his presence, arrayed in her regal attire, "to show the people and the princes her beauty." It is to be observed that Ahasuerus, as we are carefully informed, was intoxicated—his "heart was merry with wine"—otherwise he would never have issued such an order. None but women of licentious character ever appeared at entertainments given by men in Persia—an observation which also applies to the present times, and it was therefore natural that Vashti should refuse to obey the royal order, because it was considered the most degrading ignominy for any woman of reputation to appear before a company of men with her face uncovered. Herodotus, however, informs us that it was customary among the Persians at certain festivals to produce their women in public, and he relates a story of seven Persians sent to Amyntas, a Greek prince, who received them hospitably, and gave them a splendid entertainment, after which, when they began to drink, one of the Persians thus addressed him, "Prince of Macedonia, it is a custom with us Persians, whenever we have a public entertainment, to introduce our concubines and young wives."

When the Queen's refusal was announced to Ahasuerus, heated with wine, and excited by the flatteries of his guests, his exasperation was unbounded—his "anger burned within him." To understand the peculiar temperament of the king, we must recollect that the Persian monarchs, like other Oriental sovereigns, were, as they are still, most despotic—that their word was law, which it was death to disobey—and that Ahasuerus resented the refusal more furiously on this occasion, as he had been previously boasting of the beauty of Vashti; and the act of disobedience was not only exhibited

before his assembled guests, but proceeded from the harem, the inmates of which, whether wives or not, were at all times expected to evince the most devoted obedience to their husbands or masters. It tended to humble the great Ahasuerus in the eyes of his subjects, and to sanction similar acts of disobedience in all families of the kingdom. This, indeed, is clearly intimated in the future proceedings against Vashti. When the king asked his counsellors what should be done to Vashti, one of them answered in the true style of Oriental flattery—"Vashti the queen hath not done wrong to the king only, but also to all the princes, and to all the people that are in the provinces of the King Ahasuerus. For this deed of the queen shall come abroad unto all women, so that they shall despise their husbands in their eyes, when it shall be reported, The King Ahasuerus commanded Vashti the queen to be brought in before him, but she came not. Likewise shall the ladies of Persia and Media say this day unto all the king's princes, which have heard of the deed of the queen. Thus shall there arise too much contempt and wrath. If it please the king, let there go a royal commandment from him, and let it be written among the laws of the Medes and Persians, that it be not altered, That Vashti come no more before King Ahasuerus, and let the king give her royal estate unto another that is better than she. And when the king's decree, which he shall make, shall be published throughout all this empire (for it is great), all the wives shall give to their husbands honour, both to great and small."

In this advice, which the king adopted, we have an admirable elucidation of the thoughts and feelings fostered by Oriental despotism. Vashti had acted in a manner becoming her high situation—she refused to exhibit herself uncovered before an assembly of intoxicated persons, even though Ahasuerus himself was present at the drunken revelry, and had commanded her to appear. This advice was given and acted upon, after the revelry had terminated, in cool reflection,

when all the feelings of Eastern pride were roused at this act of disobedience in the harem. There is no attempt to palliate the state in which the king and his guests were at this time, and indeed the addiction of the Persians to wine is a characteristic of the nation at the present day. "We found," says Mr Morier, "that the Persians, when they commit a debauch, arise betimes, and esteem the morning as the best time for beginning to drink wine, by which means they carry on their excess until night. This contrast with our own manners will perhaps give fresh force to that passage of Isaiah (v. 11), 'Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night until wine inflame them.' This, indeed, has been the reproach of the voluptuary from the satirists and moralists of all ages and nations." Then, again, this conduct of the queen was represented as an insult to the whole nation, and deserving of severe punishment, as an example to all the women in the Empire, which is in unison with the character of the Persians in all ages. They have ever looked on their monarchs with the utmost veneration, viewing the very ground on which he treads as sacred, awarding to him a degree of sanctity unbounded, and esteeming themselves honoured in being his obedient slaves. At the present day the king of Persia is called the *Zil Allah*, or the *Shadow of the Almighty*, and receives almost divine honours. Sir John Malcolm, in his delightful "Sketches of Persia," gives us some curious illustrations of the Persian character in this respect, and of the treatment and condition of the Persian women by their husbands in their families.

But one of the most interesting intimations in the story of the deposition and dismissal of Vashti, is the announcement of the extraordinary custom which existed among the Persians and the Medes, that it was impossible for the king to revoke or alter any edict or law which he had published or sanctioned. He might nullify or modify it by

promulgating another edict, but the original one he could not recall. This irregular and foolish law, which is noticed and illustrated in other parts of the present work, was brought into operation against Vashti, and Ahasuerus registered his "royal commandment among the laws of the Medes and Persians that it be not altered." A similar practice exists in Persia at the present time. When the king announces his determination not to do any thing until a particular time, or his resolution to be guided by certain circumstances, nothing can alter it unless the fortune of war, or some other extraneous cause over which he has no control. A recent king of Persia, when marching at the head of an army, encamped in a valley, and declared that he would not move till the snow disappeared from the summits of certain neighbouring mountains. His word was law, and no one attempted to change his resolution. It happened that the snow remained longer than he anticipated, and a great number of soldiers were sent to clear it away before he would move, or break up his encampment. This feature of Oriental obstinacy is also well illustrated in an anecdote related of the celebrated Persian king, Nadir Shah, which shows that even such a law, though liable to the caprice of a tyrant, may have its influence on the feelings of the ignorant and the unprincipled in Persia. It is quoted from a Persian MS. by Sir John Malcolm. "A native merchant travelling from Cabul had been robbed in a plain near Nishapore, and carried his complaint to the sovereign. 'Was there no one near but the robbers?' said Nadir. 'None,' was the reply. 'Were there no trees, or stones, or bushes?' 'Yes,' said the man, 'there was one large solitary tree under whose shade I was reposing when I was attacked.' Nadir, on hearing this, affected great fury, and ordered two executioners to proceed immediately and flog the tree that had been described every morning, till it either restored the property that had been lost, or revealed the names of

the thieves by whom it had been taken. *The mandate of a king of Persia is always a law*,—that of Nadir was considered as irrevocable as fate. The executioners proceeded, and the tree had not suffered flagellation above a week, when all the goods that had been stolen were found one morning carefully deposited at its root. The alarmed robbers, who soon heard of the extravagant cruelty that inflicted such blows upon an inanimate substance, trembled at the very thought of the horrible punishment which awaited them if ever discovered. When the result was reported to Nadir, he smiled and said, “I knew what the flogging of that tree would produce.”

The decree of Ahasuerus against Vashti was ordered to be sent “into all the king’s provinces, according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their own language, that every man should bear rule in his own house, and that it should be published according to the language of every people.” It may appear surprising that a solitary act of disobedience on the part of the queen should have been treated in such an important manner, and certainly if we were to judge it by our own customs it appears not a little frivolous. But we must recollect the peculiar notions of the ancient Oriental nations, especially the Persians, with whom the most ordinary proceedings of the king was of the utmost consequence, and whose laws were essentially different from ours. Bishop Hall’s reflections on this incident in the life of Ahasuerus is remarkably appropriate. “The conduct of Ahasuerus with respect to Queen Vashti,” says the good Bishop, “it must be remembered, was that of an heathen, acting under the influence of anger and intemperance. It is recorded in Scripture, not that it may be imitated, or alleged as a pretence for sin, but that we may derive improvement by observing the events to which it led. His violent will, therefore, although apparently ungoverned, being nevertheless so directed by Providence, that it brought forward the remarkable preservation of the Jews,

which forms the chief subject of this Book of Esther.”

And that this was the case is farther proved from what immediately follows in the narrative, from which it appears that even the irrevocable law of the Medes and Persians was made subservient to the overruling purposes of Omnipotence. We are told that “when the wrath of King Ahasuerus was appeased he remembered Vashti.” His former affection for her revived; but he also remembered “what she had done, and what was decreed against her,” or irrevocably passed, and his mind was agitated between returning affection and his consciousness of the impossibility of restoring Vashti to her former rank, or of even admitting her to his presence. The counsellors of Ahasuerus diverted his mind toward a new object of attachment, who was to be selected in a very remarkable manner. They proposed to the king, “Let there be fair young virgins sought for the king, and let the king appoint officers in all the provinces of his kingdom, that they may gather together all the fair young virgins unto Shushan the palace, to the house of the women, unto the custody of Hege (or Hegai) the king’s chamberlain, keeper of the women, and let their things for purification be given them, and let the maiden who pleaseth the king be queen instead of Vashti.” We are farther informed that this proposal “pleased the king, and it was so.” It is probable that Vashti had been chosen in the same manner from virgins gathered together from different parts of the empire. This custom was not peculiar to Persia. It prevailed and is still prevalent in the Oriental countries, where the sovereigns have large female establishments or harems. Bruce informs us that “it has always been and still is a custom of the kings of Abyssinia to marry what number of wives they choose, but that these are not therefore all queens; among them there is one who is considered particularly as queen, and upon her head is placed the crown, and she is called the *Itege*.” In certain countries

the lady of the harem who bears the first son to the reigning sovereign is acknowledged the favourite Sultana, and consequently the queen or empress. It is evident from the intimations in the Book of Esther that the ancient Persian monarchs had only one queen properly so called; but it is ascertained from both sacred and profane history that they had a considerable number of secondary wives or concubines, who were under the control of the "keeper of the women"—an officer who answers to the chief eunuch of the modern Persian harem. This functionary is generally an aged and disagreeable person, whose office is considered one of high trust and authority; and to the ladies of the harem he is, next to the king, the most important person, as their comfort depends upon his favour, which it is the great object of their ambition to secure. It may be added, that the condition of the female establishments of the Persian kings seems by the reports of accurate travellers, and persons of distinction who have officially visited Persia, to have undergone little change from the most ancient times. Then, as now, there were three classes in the harem—the queen, the secondary wives or "concubines" in our version, who, after having engaged the notice of the king, occupied a part of the harem different from that in which they had previously resided, and the women not thus distinguished, who were therefore for the time an inferior class. The harem, which is generally an extensive building, or series of buildings, in the most secluded parts of the palace, sometimes displays great magnificence, the finest apartments of which are especially appropriated to the king's use. In this establishment all the officers, guards, functionaries, and attendants, are eunuchs and female slaves, whose various governors act under the orders of the chief eunuch, or "keeper of the women." The principal difference between the practice of the ancient and modern kings of Persia is, that the latter have several legal wives besides those of a secondary class. The constitution of the harem, the condition

and amusements of its inmates, and their several gradations of rank, are accurately described by Sir John Malcolm in his valuable "History of Persia." He informs us that "the first business of the king in the morning after he is risen is to sit from one to two hours in the hall of the harem, where his levees are conducted with the same ceremony as in his outer apartment. Female officers arrange the crowd of his wives and slaves with the strictest attention to order and precedence. After hearing the reports of those entrusted with the government of the harem, and consulting with his principal wives, who are generally seated, the monarch leaves the interior apartments." These delineations are interesting, and greatly tend to elucidate the continual references to Oriental customs in the Book of Esther, especially when we recollect, as already observed, that the mode of forming and conducting these female establishments has undergone little or no change since the time of which this history treats.

What follows of the proceedings of Ahasuerus, as given in the canonical Book of Esther, the reader will find more appropriately introduced in the history of that beautiful and distinguished daughter of Israel, which is given in its proper place. The rest of the life of this Persian monarch is unconnected with Scripture history, and it may be merely added, that if the identity of Ahasuerus with Artaxerxes Longimanus is correct, the latter, according to the common opinion of historians, distinguished himself during his long reign by mildness and humanity. The illustrious Athenian Themistocles, although a determined enemy to the Persians, found an asylum at his court, where he was treated with kindness and distinction. This incident, however, is referred by some ancient historians to the reign of Xerxes.

AHAZ, king of Judah, succeeded his father Jotham at the age of twenty years, and reigned sixteen years, or to B. C. 726 or 728. He was the most profligate and corrupt sovereign who had hitherto

appeared in Judah; he respected neither Jehovah, the Law, nor the Prophets; he broke through all the restraints which the Law imposed upon the Hebrew kings, and regarded nothing but his own depraved inclinations. He imitated the idolators whom Jehovah had rooted out in the Land of Canaan, and "he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree." He introduced the rites of the Syrians into Jerusalem, erected altars to their deities, altered the Temple in many respects to accommodate it to the Syrian model, and he at length shut up the sacred edifice entirely. We find him building an altar after a pattern procured by him at Damascus, and he is stated to have erected altars for the Syrian worship in "every corner" of Jerusalem. The cowardice of Ahaz was equal to his superstition. He was invaded by Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, his allied foes, from whom he suffered several repulses. The former recovered Elath on the Gulf of Akiba, which was an important circumstance, as it involved the final loss of whatever commerce the Hebrews may have maintained by way of Jerusalem. The Edonites revolted from him, and the Philistines were making incursions into his kingdom, when, notwithstanding a sure promise of Divine deliverance, he called Pul, the king of Assyria, to his assistance. This monarch became bound to compel the kings of Syria and Israel to relinquish their design of destroying Jerusalem, and Ahaz in consequence became tributary to him, which afforded Tiglath-pileser, Pul's successor, an opportunity of conquering Syria, Galilee, and Gilead. He made a journey to Damascus to meet Tiglath-pileser, where he saw the altar already noticed, a model of which he transmitted to Urijah the high priest, to be erected in Jerusalem. But the Assyrian king, whose aid he had so unworthily purchased, afforded Ahaz no real assistance, and Jehovah punished his apostacy and wickedness. On the contrary, Tiglath-pileser "distressed" him, and drove him

to such extremities, that he was scarcely able, with all the riches of the Temple, of his chief men, and of the royal treasury, to purchase peace from his troublesome protector. Notwithstanding his impieties, however, Ahaz died quietly at Jerusalem, and was interred in that city, but he was not deposited in the sepulchres of the kings. As the Hebrews were accustomed to honour in a peculiar manner the memory of their good kings, they also inflicted marks of disgrace on their wicked sovereigns, by not allowing them to be interred in the usual sepulchres of their ancestors in the city of David. He was succeeded by his son, the good king Hezekiah.

HAZIAH, the son and successor of Ahab, king of Israel, reigned two years over the Ten Tribes, and practised all the idolatry and impiety of his father and his mother Jezebel. In the second year of his reign, during the revolt of the Moabites after Ahab's death, he "fell down through a lattice that was in Samaria," which probably intimates that he fell from the roof of the palace into the interior court or garden, while leaning against the slight fence or balustrade, when it gave way. He was severely injured, and in the extremity of his distress, utterly disregarding the authority and power of Jehovah, he sent messengers to Ekron, in the territory of the Philistines near the Mediterranean, to inquire at the idol Baal-zebub if he would recover. His messengers were met by Elijah at the command of God, who, after severely censuring the king for his impious idolatry, told them to return to their master, and inform him that he would not "come down from the bed on which he had gone up, but would surely die." This intimates to us that Ahaziah did not sleep on the floor, as people of the highest rank often do in the East. He probably lay on the raised divan, or on such a bedstead as the one mentioned which belonged to Og, Deut. iii. 11. We are told that the principal part of this bedstead was occasionally employed to form a permanent platform or gallery at

the upper end of a room, and was sometimes so elevated that steps were provided for the ascent. The beds were and still are laid here at night—and it served as a sitting-place by day. The accurate knowledge of Elijah with respect to the reclining position of the king must have convinced him that the Prophet spoke by the command of God, and indeed, when he asked the messengers to describe the person whom they had met, and who had sent this message to him, he knew at once that they had met Elijah. Ahaziah died soon afterwards as the Prophet had foretold, and was succeeded by his brother Jehoram.

AHAZIAH, also called JEHOAHAAZ, succeeded his father Jehoram, or Joram, in the kingdom of Judah, over which he reigned only one year. His mother was Athaliah, daughter of Omri, king of Israel, and he was consequently great-grandson to Ahab, which explains his participation in the doom of Ahab's house. He suffered himself to be governed in every thing by the wicked counsels of his idolatrous mother. He united with his grand-uncle Jehoram, king of Judah, in an expedition against Hazael, king of Syria, for the recovery of Ramoth-Gilead. In this expedition Jehoram was severely wounded by the Syrians at Ramah, and found it necessary to retire to Jezreel, his summer palace, where he was visited by Ahaziah. Here both kings were slain on the same day by Jehu, B.C. 841.

AHIJAH, a Prophet of Shiloh, who is supposed to have delivered two messages from God to Solomon, one of encouragement, while he was building the Temple, and the other of severe displeasure on account of the misconduct of that prince. He is also mentioned as one of those who wrote the annals of Solomon. Ahijah predicted the usurpation of Jeroboam, and the misfortunes which were to befall his family on account of his idolatry. We read that during the reign of Solomon, and after that prince had become addicted to idolatrous practices, Jeroboam was one day

met without the walls of Jerusalem by this Prophet. He took a new cloak which Jeroboam is said to have worn (but which he himself rather wore), and tearing it in twelve pieces, said, "Take ten for thyself, for thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give Ten Tribes to thee." Jeroboam sent his queen to consult this Prophet concerning the illness of his son Abijah, and she was told that he alone of all his descendants would die a natural death.

AHIMAAZ, the son of Zadok the high priest, succeeded his father in the reign of Solomon. He rendered David an important service during the rebellion of Absalom, for while his father Zadok was in Jerusalem with Hushai, he and Jonathan continued near the fountain Rogel, whither a maid-servant came to inform them of the resolutions of Absalom's council. They instantly departed to give the king intelligence, but Absalom was informed of their conduct, and sent orders to pursue them. Ahimaaaz and his companion eluded the pursuit by retiring to a house in Bahurim, in the court-yard of which there was a well, and into the sides of this they concealed themselves, the woman of the house spreading a covering, which contained ground or parched corn, on the mouth of the well. When Absalom's party came up and inquired after them, they received an evasive answer, and after continuing the pursuit in a wrong direction they returned to Jerusalem. Ahimaaaz and Jonathan were thus enabled to join David. He was succeeded in the high priesthood by Azariah.

AHIMELECH was the son of Ahitub, and brother of Ahiah, whom he succeeded in the high priesthood. When David found it necessary to retire from Saul he went to Nob, where the tabernacle was then placed, and which was the residence of Ahimelech and the other priests. David sought an interview with the high priest, pretending urgent business from the king, and persuaded him to give him the shewbread, as he had no other in the house.

David also requested and obtained the sword he had worn at the slaughter of Goliath. Doeg the Edomite was then at Nob, and he related to Saul all that had passed. The king immediately sent for Ahimelech and the priests, and after upbraiding them for conspiring with David against him, ordered his attendants to put them to death. They refused, and Saul found a ready minister of his cruelty in Doeg, who on that day massacred fourscore and five persons, including the high priest. He afterwards went to Nob, and put men, women, and children to the sword; but Abiathar, one of Ahimelech's sons, escaped, and fled to David.

AHITHOPEL, a native of Giloh, a place not far from Hebron, was deeply involved in Absalom's rebellion against his father. The Jews think that he was the grandfather of Bathsheba, and that he readily joined in the conspiracy to avenge the dishonour of his grand-daughter and the murder of her husband Uriah. This statement, however, is not reconcilable with the probable conjecture that Absalom's design was planned and carried into execution in consequence of the rumour that he, though the eldest surviving son, was to be supplanted in the throne by Solomon, the son of Bathsheba. Ahithopel had been one of David's counsellors before he joined Absalom, and he was evidently a man of considerable ability, more especially as it was found necessary to employ Hushai, the friend of David, to counteract his counsels, and to deprive Absalom of the advantages he was likely to derive from his advice. One of the counsels of Ahithopel, which Absalom adopted, was calculated to render David irreconcilable to his son, and to afford no hope of pardon to the rebels. This was the seizure of David's females—an insult the most revolting of which Absalom could possibly be guilty towards his father, though it is possible that Ahithopel might have thought that the new king had a right to his predecessor's wives, which was the general custom among the Persians and other Oriental princes, and

was very common in ancient times. Another of Ahithopel's counsels was to kill David, but in this case Hushai's advice was asked, and he recommended the assembling of the whole forces of Israel, putting Absalom at their head, and overwhelming David by their numbers. This counsel was preferred to that of Ahithopel, who probably foresaw Absalom's defeat and his own certain punishment as a traitor; and he retired disgusted to his house at Giloh, where he put an end to his life in despair by hanging himself. This is the account given by the inspired historian, but some writers pretend that he died of a quinsy; others, that he choked himself with rage when he perceived the ruin of Absalom's party by the adoption of Hushai's advice; and others, again, allege that he caused one of his servants to strangle him.

ALCIMUS, or JACIMUS, a man of unprincipled character constituted high priest of the Jews by Antiochus Eupator at the death of Menelaus, but not acknowledged by them as such because he had conformed to the customs of the Greeks in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He assembled together all those Jews then residing at Antioch who had been expelled from Judea for their apostasy, and went at the head of them to Demetrius Soter, the successor of Eupator, imploring relief against Judas Maccabæus and his brethren, whom he accused of being enemies to the kings of Syria, fomentors of sedition, and murderers of his most faithful subjects. Believing this statement, Demetrius sent an army into Judea in the year B.C. 161, under the command of Bacchides, to establish Alcimus in his office by force. Bacchides entered the country under the pretence of friendship, and many Jews who confided in his promises of protection were treacherously put to death. After confirming the authority of Alcimus, Bacchides withdrew his troops, leaving with the high priest a force sufficient for his security. No sooner had the Syrian commander retired than Judas Maccabæus again took the field, marched

throughout Judea without opposition, and severely punished the apostate Jews. Alcimus could offer no effectual resistance, and he was compelled to retreat to Antioch, where he renewed his complaint and accusations against Judas. Demetrius Soter sent another army to Judea under the command of Nicator, with orders to kill the Jewish chief or take him prisoner, and to put Alcimus in peaceable possession of his office. But Judas avoided all the snares of the Syrian commander, and not long afterwards Nicator was defeated and slain in a pitched battle, and his whole army routed and entirely dispersed. This disaster brought Bacchides again into Judea at the head of a large army, the apostate Jews once more regained the ascendancy, the country was ravaged, and all the adherents of Judas Maccabæus who fell in the way of the Syrians were massacred. Alcimus was now re-established in the high priesthood, but he did not long enjoy his triumph. In the year B.C. 159, when he ordered the lower wall which separated the court of the Gentiles from the court of the Israelites in the Temple to be thrown down, that the Pagans might have free access, he was suddenly seized with cramp or with palsy, and died in great agony. Bacchides immediately withdrew his troops, and the Jews enjoyed two years of tranquillity. The reader will find all the particulars respecting this period of Jewish history, of which the preceding sketch is a condensation, in the Books of the Maccabees and in Josephus.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT, the celebrated king of Macedonia, and conqueror of the world, is mentioned by name as the son of "Philip the Macedonian," only in the commencement of the First Book of the Maccabees, where his wars and conquests are briefly noticed, his death, and the partition of his empire by his generals. He is, however, distinctly announced in Daniel's vision of the ram and the he-goat—the former having two horns, denoting the empire of the Medes and Persians, and the latter

indicating the Grecian or Macedonian empire acquired by Alexander the Great, who utterly overthrew the Persians. As this extraordinary hero of antiquity is not connected with Scripture history, any account of his reign would be superfluous in the present work.

ALEXANDER, also named BALAS, is called the "son of Antiochus," 1 Macc. x. 1, which means that he was the *reputed* son of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria. This is the opinion of Dr Hales and other learned writers. "He was," says Dr Hales, "in reality an impostor of Rhodes, named Balas, set up in opposition to Demetrius by the kings of Egypt and Pergamus, and patronized by the Romans, who never forgave the flight of Demetrius from Rome, and his assumption of the Syrian power without their consent. They now, therefore, by a decree empowered the impostor to raise forces for the recovery of the kingdom, with which he sailed to Ptolemais, secured the city, and was joined by numbers of the Syrians disaffected to Demetrius." On the other hand, Mr Whiston thus expresses the arguments of those who contend for the legitimacy of Alexander Balas. "This Alexander Balas," he says, "who certainly pretended to be the son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and was owned for such by the Jews and Romans and many others, and yet is by several historians deemed a counterfeit, and of no family at all, is, however, by Josephus believed to have been the real son of that Antiochus, and by him always spoken of accordingly. And truly since the original contemporary and authentic author of the First Book of the Maccabees calls him the son of Antiochus, I suppose the other writers, who are all much later, are not to be followed against such evidence, though perhaps Epiphanes may have had him by a woman of no family. The king of Egypt also, Philometer, soon gave him his daughter in marriage, which he would hardly have done if he had believed him to be a counterfeit, and of so very mean a birth as the later historians pretend."

It is unnecessary to inquire whether Alexander Balas was an impostor or the son of Antiochus, though the accumulated historical evidence may well incline us to the former opinion. What Dr Hales states in his observations already quoted is undeniable, that the Roman Senate, from hatred to Demetrius Soter, promised Balas the kingdom of Syria. Under the title of *Alexander, king of Syria*, Balas levied troops and sailed to Ptolemais, where his party was strengthened by the accession of numbers of discontented persons, 1 Macc. x. 1.

Demetrius Soter, who had retired to a new palace he had built at Antioch, and there resigned himself to luxury and to pleasure, was at length roused from his lethargy, and collected a numerous army, B.C. 154, but Balas, supported by the Romans, was ready to meet him in the field. Both parties were at this crisis anxious to secure the friendship of Jonathan Maccabæus, who was able to render essential service to the cause he espoused. Demetrius Soter made the first overtures to gain Jonathan to his party. The latter was offered the government of Judea, with full power to levy soldiers, and the Jewish hostages detained in the citadel of Jerusalem were promised to be released. When Jonathan read the letter of Demetrius to the garrison of Jerusalem, they immediately delivered up the hostages; the Syrian troops left by Bacchides in the fortified towns of Judea were withdrawn from the country, with the exception of the garrisons of Bethsura and the castle of Jerusalem, which consisted chiefly of apostate Jews who were afraid to leave their places of refuge. When Balas heard of the offers of Demetrius, he resolved to excel him in liberality. In his letter to Jonathan he called him his brother, gave him the title and rank of the king's friend, appointed him to the high priesthood, and sent him a crown of gold, and a purple robe as ethnarch or prince of Judea. The office of the high priesthood was thus transferred from the race of Jozadak, who were of the first class of the priests, and in whom it had

remained since the time of Cyrus, to the Asmonean family, of a remote and inferior class, with whom it continued till the time of Herod, who changed the priesthood from an office of inheritance to one of arbitrary will and pleasure. Jonathan closed with the offers of Balas, for at the feast of tabernacles he put on the pontifical robe, and appeared as the high priest of the Jewish nation. But when Demetrius was informed of the proposals of Balas he wrote to Jonathan, and endeavoured to outdo his rival in the generosity of his promises, but his offers were so extravagant as to defeat their object. The Jews gave them no credit, especially when they recollected what they had formerly suffered from Demetrius, and Jonathan and the whole nation espoused the cause of Alexander Balas.

In the year B.C. 152, the two competitors, Demetrius and Balas, took the field at the head of their respective armies, and the latter lost his first battle; but he kept his ground, and being reinforced by his powerful allies, he was the conqueror in a second battle, B.C. 150, in which Demetrius was slain. This victory placed Alexander Balas on the throne of Syria, and he sent an embassy to Egypt, demanding Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, in marriage. His request was not only granted, but that king conducted his daughter in person to Ptolemais, where the nuptials were celebrated with great magnificence. Jonathan Maccabæus proceeded to Ptolemais on this occasion, and was received by both kings with the most marked distinction. All the accusations which the discontented Jews brought against him were rejected without a hearing. Alexander honoured him with a purple robe, numbered him among his principal friends, made him military commander of Judea, and raised him to the rank of a *meridarch*, or a ruler of a part of the Syrian kingdom.

No sooner was Alexander secure on his throne than he resigned himself entirely to voluptuousness and debauchery, and entrusted the management of his

affairs to a favourite named Ammonius, who conducted himself in such a tyrannical and cruel manner that he soon rendered himself and his master odious to the whole nation. He murdered a son and a sister of Demetrius Soter, and all the other members of that family he could get into his power. This increased the hatred of the nation, and Demetrius, the eldest son of the deceased king, availed himself of this state of the public feeling to attempt the recovery of his rights. He was acknowledged by Apollonius, governor of Cælo-Syria and Phenice, who, when Alexander at length took the field, challenged both him and Jonathan to meet him in arms. "Jonathan," says the historian, "advanced with ten thousand men, took possession of Joppa before the eyes of Apollonius, overcame their governor in a pitched battle, subdued Ashdod, to which the enemy had retired after his defeat, and laid the city in ashes. Askalon opened its gates to the conqueror and gave him a magnificent reception, and he then returned to Jerusalem enriched by the spoils of his enemies. When Alexander heard of these victories he presented this faithful vassal with a gold chain, such as worn by none but princes, and gave him possession of Ekron. This city was peopled by Jews, or the original inhabitants had submitted to circumcision and adopted the Jewish religion, and had thus become one people with the Hebrews, as the Jebusites of Jerusalem had done in ancient times."

Alexander, now aware of his situation, applied to his father-in-law for assistance, and in the year B.C. 146, Ptolemy Philometor proceeded along the coast of Palestine to Syria, attended by a fleet, and with an army so numerous that the author of the Maccabees compares it to the sand on the sea-shore. As soon as he arrived at Ptolemais he was either informed or he pretended that Ammonius had concerted a plot against his life, and that Alexander himself was privy to this treachery. He complained to the latter, and demanded Ammonius

to be delivered up to him; but Alexander refused, and this made him allege that the favourite was only executing his master's orders. Meanwhile, in compliance with the orders of Alexander, all the cities had opened their gates to Ptolemy, who reduced them entirely under his own power by placing a garrison in each. At Joppa the Egyptian king was met by Jonathan, whom he received in the most friendly manner, and they marched together as far as Eleutherus, whence the latter returned to Jerusalem. Ptolemy now appeared openly as the enemy of Alexander, and sent an embassy to Demetrius, offering him his daughter Cleopatra, the wife of Alexander, in marriage, and promising to place him on the throne of Syria. Demetrius accepted the offer, and as Ptolemy drew near to Antioch the citizens excited an insurrection, and murdered the hated favourite Ammonius while he was attempting to escape in female disguise, but they refused to declare in favour of Demetrius. Nevertheless, such was their hatred towards Alexander that they entered into a confederacy against him, opened their gates to Ptolemy, and made him an offer of the crown of Syria. The king of Egypt declined, alleging that he could not, without the most flagrant injustice, place himself on the throne of Syria to the exclusion of the lawful heir, and recommended Demetrius by a panegyric on his character, pledging himself as a guarantee for his future conduct, and promising to assist him by his counsels. These representations had the desired effect, and Demetrius was placed on the throne of his ancestors.

Alexander Balas was then in Cilicia, where he had taken the field against his rival, and when he was informed of the proceedings of Ptolemy he returned to Syria with his whole army. He advanced to Antioch, but in the march he was met by Ptolemy, and a battle ensued in which he was defeated, and his adherents espoused the cause of Demetrius. Alexander fled to Abæ in Arabia, where he took refuge with the emir Zabdiel,

or, according to Diodorus, Diocles, under whose protection he had placed his children at the commencement of the war. Zabdiel barbarously murdered him in the fifth or sixth year of his reign over Syria, and sent his head to Ptolemy. But the king of Egypt did not long enjoy the triumph. He had been dangerously hurt during the battle by a fall from his horse, and when the head of the murdered Alexander was brought to him by the emissaries of the treacherous Arab, the joy he felt on the occasion caused his death, in the thirty-fifth year of his reign over Egypt. Demetrius then ascended the throne of Syria without opposition, and assumed the surname of *Nicator*, or the *Conqueror*.

ALEXANDER, the name of several persons noticed in the Apostolic writings, of whom few particulars are known. ALEXANDER is mentioned in the Gospel of St Mark, who assisted our Saviour in carrying his cross on the way to Mount Calvary. ALEXANDER, called also Lysimachus, the Alabarch of Alexandria and brother of Philo, was, according to some statements, the same who was in company with the priests when the Apostles were carried before them to give an account of their doctrine, Acts iv. 6. ALEXANDER was an Ephesian Jew who addressed the assemblage that clamoured against St Paul, but when he was recognized as a Jew the multitude exclaimed more vehemently, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." It is not known whether he was for or against the Apostle. ALEXANDER, whom St Paul calls a *coppersmith*, is mentioned as a person whom he excommunicated along with Hymenius.

ALPHILEUS, the father of St James, commonly called *St James the Less*, the first bishop of Jerusalem; also, the name of the father of St Matthew.

AMAN, the name of Haman in the Apocryphal additions to the Book of Esther.

AMNON was the eldest son of David by his wife Ahinoam, a native of Jezreel. He was killed by the servants of Absa-

lom, to revenge his treatment of Tamar, Absalom's sister.

AMON, king of Judah, was the son and successor of Manasseh. He derived little benefit from the instructive example of his father, as he restored idolatry, and "served the idols which his father served, and worshipped them." A conspiracy was formed against him, and he was assassinated in the second year of his reign, B.C. 642. The regicides were put to death, and his son Josiah, then eight years of age, succeeded to the throne.

AMOS, a Prophet, contemporary with Hosea, both of whom lived in the reigns of Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam II., king of Israel. Amos, whom some have conjectured to be the father of Isaiah, while others contend for a different person, was a native of Tekoah, a town in the territory of Judah, adjacent to a wilderness of considerable extent, where he was a herdsman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit. He had no regular education in the schools of the Prophets, but was called by an express commission from God to prophecy to Israel. Bishop Lowth pronounces him nearly equal to the very first Prophets in elevation of sentiment and loftiness of spirit, and scarcely inferior to any of them in splendour of diction and beauty of composition. He borrows many images from the scenes in which he was engaged, but he introduces them with skill, and gives them force and dignity by the eloquence and grandeur of his manner. No Prophet has more magnificently described the Deity, more gravely rebuked the luxurious, or reproved injustice and oppression with greater warmth and more generous indignation. The Prophecy of Amos chiefly relates to the Ten Tribes, or kingdom of Israel, though he briefly denounces God's judgments against Judah, Syria, the Philistines, and other neighbouring nations. No particulars of his history, or of the time and manner of his death, are known. AMOS, or AMOZ, is also the name of one of our Saviour's human ancestors, Luke iii. 25.

AMPLIAS, a Roman Christian, to

whom St Paul sends his commendations, and whom he designates his "beloved in the Lord," Rom. xvi. 8.

AMRAM, of the tribe of Levi, is distinguished in sacred history as the father of Aaron and Moses. He died in Egypt in the hundred and thirty-seventh year of his age.

ANANIAS, and his wife SAPPHIRA, were early converts to Christianity at Jerusalem. It appears from the Evangelical historian that shortly after the day of Pentecost the members of the Church in the holy city, animated by a devoted zeal, contributed liberally whatsoever they possessed for the common benefit of their brethren; and many of those who were proprietors of lands and houses sold these, and "brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the Apostles' feet, and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." Among these Ananias "sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it." He was detected by St Peter, and after a severe rebuke from the Apostle he was suddenly deprived of life. His wife Sapphira, who appeared soon after, persisted in the falsehood, and experienced a similar fate. This affecting incident is related by the historian in a very general manner, but it is evident that the crime for which Ananias and his wife were so signally punished was of a very aggravated description. He made a fraudulent attempt to deceive the Apostle and the Church by endeavouring to procure a maintenance for himself at the general expense, while he privately retained that which ought to have been put into the common treasury to entitle him to his proportion. St Peter reproved him and exposed his conduct on the strict principles of justice and of equity. He charged him with "lying to the Holy Ghost" in keeping back part of the money he had obtained for his property.—"While it remained," said the Apostle, "was it not thine own? and after it was sold was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in

thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." The punishment of this man and his wife, as Archbishop Newcome remarks, displayed the knowledge, power, and divine mission of those who were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and deterred interested persons from joining the Christians from mercenary motives to partake of their goods and alms.

ANANIAS, a Christian residing at Damascus, whom St Paul describes as a "devout man according to the Law, having a good report of all the Jews that dwelt there." When the illustrious Apostle was arrested in his persecuting expedition to Damascus by the voice from heaven, he was led into that city, where he continued three days without sight and without partaking of food. Ananias was ordered in a vision to repair to the house in which St Paul resided in a certain street, and put his hand on him that he might receive his sight. The character of St Paul was well known to Ananias, and as he was ignorant of what had befallen the future Apostle near the gate of the city, he ventured to hint at the danger he would probably incur by putting himself in his power. But he was positively informed that his fears were now groundless, and that the distinguished convert was a "chosen vessel" to preach the gospel to the "Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel." Thus assured, Ananias proceeded to the house, where he found St Paul, and putting his hands on him, said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." The future Apostle's sight was restored, and he was made a member of the Church by baptism.

ANANIAS, or ANIÑUS, was the son of a high priest of the same name, and was made high priest of the Jews by Agrippa, about A.D. 60 or 63, when Albinus was appointed Procurator of Judea by the Emperor Nero at the death of Festus. He was a harsh and strenuous

Sadducee, and very cruel in his punishments. His arbitrary conduct excited discontent against him, and Agrippa deposed him from the high priesthood three months after his elevation. Josephus tells us that he "assembled the sanhedrim of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others, and delivered them to be stoned"—a proceeding which gave great offence to the citizens of Jerusalem, who represented the conduct of Ananias to Albinus, and caused him to be severely reprimanded. Although he had been deposed from the high priesthood, yet, as he was the richest man in the nation, he soon purchased the favour of Albinus, and not only employed his slaves in taking the priests' tithes from the threshing-floors, but he procured from Albinus the release of those robbers and desperate characters who had been taken by him as a means of recovering those slaves whom the robbers had seized. The state of society in Judea at this period may be easily inferred from the observations of Professor Jahn. "Whenever any of the robbers fell into the hands of Albinus, their comrades were always sure of obtaining their release by seizing some of the slaves of Ananias, and as they were thus secure from punishment, they became more numerous and daring. Even the Procurator himself did not hesitate to promote theft and rapine when it contributed to his own interest, and he might have been regarded without impropriety as the head of all the robbers in the country." The riches of Ananias, in a word, enabled him to surpass most of his contemporaries in violence and rapine, and his party, which he was continually increasing by his presents, was superior to all the others.

Ananias is introduced in the Acts of the Apostles as conducting himself with great insolence to St Paul. He told some of his attendants to strike the Apostle on the mouth—one of the greatest insults which can be offered in Oriental countries. This wanton and unmerited outrage drew from St Paul a most indignant

reproach. "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall, for sittest thou to judge me after the Law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the Law?" About five years after this Ananias was dragged from an aqueduct in which he had concealed himself from a tumult, and was put to death by assassins. Michaelis and others argue that Ananias, previous to his affair with St Paul, had been dispossessed of the high priesthood, and that on this occasion he usurped an office to which he had no right.

ANDREW, one of the chosen Apostles of our Saviour, was a native of Bethsaida, a town on the Lake of Galilee. His father's name was John, or Jonas, a fisherman of that town, and he was the brother of St Peter, but whether elder or younger is not agreed by the early ecclesiastical writers. As Dr Cave has collected all the particulars of the life of St Andrew, the following account is condensed from his "*Antiquitates Apostolicæ*." John the Baptist, who introduced our Saviour to the Jews as the promised Messiah, pointed him out to St Andrew and another disciple as the Lamb of God, and they accompanied Christ to the place of his residence. After some conversation with our blessed Saviour, St Andrew returned, and acquainted his brother St Peter. He seems to have been the first disciple of Christ, for he understood the sacrificial allusion of the Baptist, and said to his brother, "We have found the Messiah." He was afterwards chosen one of the Twelve Apostles, and was commissioned with the others to preach the gospel throughout the world.

This is the substance of all which the Evangelical writers have recorded of St Andrew; but tradition has added several particulars of less authenticity, although some of them are entitled to attention. It is related that when the Apostles arranged the plan of their mission after the day of Pentecost, to St Andrew was allotted Scythia and the neighbouring countries. He is reported to have travelled throughout Cappadocia, Galatia, and Bithynia, and to have visited the shores of the

Euxine Sea, preaching the gospel with great success, converting and baptizing many, and convincing not a few of the foreign Jews that Christ was the Messiah. After visiting various towns, in which he met with difficulties and discouragements, he came to Sinope, a city situated on the Euxine, where he met his brother St Peter, and they are both alleged to have remained a considerable time at this place. St Andrew is said to have suffered some severe injuries from the Jews of that town, who attempted to burn the house in which he resided, treating him at the same time with "savage cruelty, throwing him to the ground, stamping upon him with their feet, dragging him from place to place, some beating him with clubs, others pelting him with stones, and even biting him with their teeth, until, apprehending that they had fully dispatched him, they cast him out of the city." We are told, however, that he recovered from these injuries, and "publicly returned to the city, whereby, and by some other miracles which he wrought amongst them, he reduced many to a better mind, converting them to the faith."

St Andrew is farther reported to have left Sinope, and to have visited several cities and provinces. From Chersonesus he returned by sea to Sinope, where he appointed Philologus, one of St Paul's disciples, to govern the church in that city. Thence he proceeded to Byzantium, also called Constantinople, where he founded an Apostolical see, over which he placed Stachys, whom St Paul designates his "beloved Stachys." This fact is mentioned by several ancient ecclesiastical writers, and especially by Nicephorus, the Patriarch of Constantinople. Being compelled, however, to leave that city, he traversed Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Achaia, and at Patrae, in the last mentioned country, he suffered martyrdom by crucifixion on two pieces of timber crossing each other in the centre, forming what is well known as St Andrew's Cross. A spurious work, entitled "The Acts of the Passion of St

Andrew," and pretended to have been written by the presbyters and deacons of Achaia, contains a lengthened account of his martyrdom. This production states that the Apostle converted Maximilla, the wife, and Stratocles, the brother of Ægeas, proconsul of Achaia, which greatly irritated that functionary against him. The following quotation will serve as a specimen of the narrative now mentioned. "The proconsul first commanded him to be scourged, seven lictors successively whipping his naked body; and seeing his invincible patience and constancy, commanded him to be crucified, but to be fastened to the cross with cords instead of nails, that his death might be more lingering. As he was led to execution, to which he went with a cheerful and composed mind, the people exclaimed that he was an innocent and good man, and unjustly condemned to die. Having prayed, and exhorted the people to constancy and perseverance in that religion which he had taught them, he was fastened to the cross, whereon he hung two days, teaching and instructing the people all the time; and when great importunities were used with the proconsul to spare his life, he earnestly prayed that he might at this time depart and seal the truth of the Christian religion by his death. God heard his prayer, and he expired on the last day of November, though in what year no certain account can be recovered."

The legend farther informs us that the body of the Apostle was afterwards embalmed and honourably interred by Maximilla. His body was subsequently removed by order of Constantine the Great to Constantinople, and deposited in the great church of that city built to the honour of the Apostles. It is stated that when the church was repaired in after-times by the Emperor Justinian, the body of the Apostle was discovered in a wooden coffin. Gregory of Tours gravely assures us that on the anniversary of his martyrdom "there was wont to flow from his tomb a most fragrant and precious oil, which, according to its quantity, denoted

the scarcity or plenty of the following year, and that the sick who were anointed with it were restored to their former health." He adds, that "some years the oil burst out in such plenty that the stream rose to the middle of the church." It is almost unnecessary to observe, that these traditions are for the most part fanciful, and are to be received as mere embellishments fondly cherished in superstitious times. The statement that the Apostle was crucified on the peculiar cross which bears his name, or on an olive tree, as some have asserted, is entitled to no credit, nor is it certain that he was crucified. The writings attributed to this Apostle are altogether spurious.

ANDRONICUS, one of the leading men at the court of Antiochus Epiphanes, was entrusted with the government of Antioch, when that prince marched to reduce some revolted places in Cilicia. Menelaus, the pretended high priest of the Jews, resolved to embrace the opportunity of the king's absence, and engage Andronicus to dis-patch his rival Onias. He proceeded to Antioch with large presents to the Syrian governor. When Onias was informed of this he sharply expostulated against the proceedings, and retired to the sanctuary at Daphne to be secure against any personal violence. But Andronicus, influenced by Menelaus, drew him from his retreat under the most solemn oaths of safety, and instantly killed him. When the king returned, he expressed the greatest grief for the fate of Onias, and ordered Andronicus to be put to death on the same spot.

ANDRONICUS was a Christian at Rome, to whom St Paul sends his salutations. He is mentioned with Junia, and the Apostle designates them his "kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, who were of note among the Apostles," and who were zealous disciples before his own conversion.

ANNA, the wife of Tobit, of the tribe of Naphtali, at the captivity of the Tribes by the king of Assyria. After her husband lost his sight, and was become poor, Anna earned money by spinning, which

she brought home for the use of the family. Tobit enjoined his son Tobias to bury her near him.

ANNA, the name of a prophetess of the tribe of Asher, who was an aged widow at the time of our Saviour's birth. She is honourably mentioned as continually attending the service of the Temple with great devotion, fasting at the accustomed season, and always present at the time of prayer. She declared by inspiration the infant Saviour to be the Messiah, and spoke of him as such to many devout persons then in Jerusalem, who were prepared to acknowledge the truth, and in ardent expectation of the long-promised Glory of Israel.

ANNAS, or ANANUS, the father of the high priest Ananias mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, was high priest of the Jews, A.D. 26, or at least shortly before our Saviour commenced his public ministry. He was succeeded by his son-in-law Caiaphas, shortly after whose accession to that office Pontius Pilate came to Judea as governor. Annas and Caiaphas are mentioned by St Luke as being high priests conjunctly, or at the same time, and it has therefore been the subject of discussion in what sense they are so designated by the Evangelical historian. By the Law of Moses there was only one high priest among the Jews, whose office continued for life. This, however, was not invariably observed, and after the conquest of Judea by the Romans the high priests appear to have been appointed by interest, or during pleasure. Josephus informs us that Annas had exercised the office eleven years, and had been deposed by the Roman governor before the time referred to by St Luke; and it is expressly stated that Caiaphas was the actual high priest at the time our Saviour was crucified. Annas, or Ananus, was raised to the dignity of high priest by Publius Sulpicius Quirinus, who continued in office it is certain until about A.D. 23. The successor of Quirinus as procurator of Judea was Valerius Gratus, who deposed Annas, and conferred the office on Ismael, the

son of Phabus. He next gave it to Eleazar, the son of Annas, afterwards to Simon, the son of Camithus, and finally, in A.D. 25, to Joseph, called Caiaphas, who was the son-in-law of Annas. When St Luke, therefore, mentions that Annas and Caiaphas were the high priests, he groups a number of facts together, without intending to be particularly minute. Dr Paley appropriately observes on this subject, that there is an "indeterminateness in the use of the title of high priest in the Gospels; sometimes it is applied exclusively to the person who held the office at the time; sometimes to one or two more, who probably shared with him some of the powers or the functions of the office; and sometimes to such of the priests as were eminent for their station and character; and the same indeterminateness is found in Josephus, who on one occasion mentions two high priests, Jonathan and Ananias—a case precisely similar to this of Annas and Caiaphas."

ANTIOCHUS, the name of several kings of Syria, some of whom are mentioned in the Books of the Maccabees. See **MACCAREES**.

ANTIPAS, an early martyr of the Church at Pergamos, of whom nothing authentic is preserved. The Christians of Pergamos had been called to suffer even before the date of the Apostolical Epistle in the Apocalypse, in which Antipas is designated the "faithful martyr," Rev. ii. 13. It does not appear at what period this took place, but circumstances render it probable that it was during the persecution raised by the Emperor Domitian. It is not unlikely that Antipas was the victim of a local tumult, as the introduction of the gospel into such a city as Pergamos would give rise to insult and outrage. In the *Acts of Antipas*, which are still extant, it is related that he was one of our Saviour's first disciples, and afterwards bishop of Pergamos, and that he was put to death by being enclosed in a heated brazen bull. But we nowhere read that the Romans ever put any one to death in that manner, and the work is evidently spurious.

ANTIPAS. See **HEROD**.

APELLES, a Christian at Rome whom St Paul mentions as "approved in Christ," and to whom he sends his affectionate salutations. The Greeks allege that Apelles was one of the Seventy Disciples, and afterwards Bishop of Heraclea. They commemorate him on the 31st of October.

APOLLONIUS, a Syrian general, and governor of Coelo-Syria and Phenice in the time of Judas Maccabeus, and during the reigns of Epiphanes and Demetrius. He arrived at Jerusalem, B.C. 167, with a division of 22,000 from his army, two years after the conquest and cruel treatment of the city by Epiphanes himself. On the first Sabbath after his arrival, he sent out his soldiers to massacre all the men they met, and to make slaves of the women and children. The streets of Jerusalem flowed with blood, the houses were plundered, and the city walls thrown down. Apollonius demolished the houses which stood near Mount Zion, and he strengthened the fortifications of the castle with the materials he thus obtained, and in which he placed a garrison under his own command. The castle was so situated that it gave Apollonius complete control over the Temple, and the Jews could no longer visit their sanctuary to perform the services of religion. The daily sacrifice ceased, and Jerusalem was deserted, the inhabitants being obliged to consult their safety by flight. In the following year, B.C. 166, Judas Maccabeus succeeded his father Mattathias, and he engaged and defeated Apollonius in a battle, in which he obtained the sword of the Syrian general. Some years afterwards, about B.C. 150, either this Apollonius or another of the same name, who was educated at Rome with Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, sustained a defeat from Jonathan the high priest, who took Ashdod, and destroyed it by fire. When Demetrius recovered the crown of Syria this Apollonius became his chief favourite, and was appointed governor of Coelo-Syria and Phenice. He was continued

in that office by Alexander Balas, but he revolted from him, and espoused the interest of Demetrius, the son of his old master, and marched his forces against Jonathan, to compel him to act in a similar manner.—In the Books of the Maccabees several persons are mentioned of the name of Apollonius. The one first noticed is called the son of Menestheus, one of the principal nobles of Antiochus, who was sent by that king into Egypt, with the pretence of congratulating Ptolemy Philometor on his coronation, but his real object was to discover the intentions of the Egyptian court with respect to Cælo-Syria and Palestine. Finding those intentions to be hostile, he came by sea to Joppa to take a view of the frontiers of Egypt, and to put them in a state of defence. In this progress, according to Dr Prideaux, he came to Jerusalem. The author of the Maccabees calls him a “detestable ringleader,” 2 Macc. v. 24. Another Apollonius was the son of Gennæus, 2 Macc. xii. 2.

APOLLOS, a native Jew of Alexandria, and a Christian convert, was celebrated in the time of the Apostles for his eloquence and knowledge of the Scriptures. Luther supposes the Epistle to the Hebrews to be written by him, chiefly because he is described as peculiarly eloquent—an opinion which has been adopted by others without any sanction from ecclesiastical authority. The name of Apollos or Apelles has induced some writers to conjecture that his parents were Gentiles who had become proselytes to Judaism after his birth. The city of Alexandria had been long celebrated for its Academy and its Library, and in its schools Apollos was instructed in rhetorical science and in the learning of the times. In A.D. 54 he went to Ephesus, and during the absence of St Paul he preached the gospel in the synagogue, and demonstrated from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. He had previously met Aquila and Priscilla, by whom he had been instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, and his zeal, learning, and commanding eloquence, seconded

by the more private exertions of his instructors, made many converts. Apollos, however, did not remain long in Ephesus, as we find him soon afterwards at Corinth, where he was also eminently successful; and such was his popularity that many considered him their leader in opposition to St Peter and St Paul. He is said to have “mightily convinced,” or vehemently, confuted the Jews. St Jerome assures us that he subsequently became Bishop of Corinth. Apollos, it is farther said, was so displeased with the division which happened there on his account, that he retired to Crete with Zenas, a doctor of the Law, but when the disturbance was appeased by St Paul’s Epistle to the Corinthians, he returned to that city. In the Greek calendar Apollos is styled bishop of Duras, but they also make him bishop of Colophon in Asia. According to Ferrarius, he was bishop of Iconium in Phrygia, and others locate him at Cæsarea.

AQUILA was a converted Jew, born in Pontus, whom St Paul found residing with his wife Priscilla at Corinth, having been compelled to leave Italy by a decree of the Emperor Claudius, who expelled the Jews from Rome for alleged tumultuous conduct, or who at least prohibited their religious assemblies, which was equivalent to expulsion. Aquila was a tent-maker by trade, and as that was the profession of St Paul, he took up his residence with him and his wife at Corinth. On the following year we find them both accompanying the Apostle to Ephesus, where they met with Apollos, and “expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly.” It appears that they afterwards resided at Rome, as St Paul salutes them in his Epistle to the Romans, and designates them his “helpers in Christ Jesus, who,” he adds, “have for my life laid down their own necks, unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles.” The Apostle, doubtless, here alludes to some great danger to which Aquila and Priscilla had exposed themselves in defending him from the violence of the

Jews, in the tumult which they excited at Corinth during the Proconsulship of Gallio. He also salutes the "church that is in their house," meaning their Christian family, so designated when a family consisted entirely of converts. The Greeks designate Aquila a bishop and apostle, and commemorate him and Priscilla on the 12th of July. In the Roman calendar their festival is placed on the 8th of that month.

ARCHELAUS, king of Judea, properly so called, and of Samaria and Idumea, was the son of Herod the Great by his fifth wife Malthace of Samaria, who was also the mother of Herod Antipas, and of their sister Olympias. Herod appointed his son Archelaus his successor in the kingdom by will, which was publicly read at his decease, and the latter obtained the crown in the first year of our Saviour, or the third year before the vulgar era. He did not, however, assume the regal title until the will of his father was approved by Augustus. After eight days of mourning he gave a feast to the people, and promised them an administration more equitable than that of his father, but he deferred the consideration of several petitions then presented to him until his authority was confirmed by the Emperor. The people were for the most part willing to wait, but a tumult was excited by the Pharisees, by which the solemnity of the Passover that year was interrupted, and about three thousand of the rioters were killed. After the suppression of this tumult, Archelaus went to Rome in company with his aunt Salome, who had promised to use her influence with Augustus in his favour, though her real intention was to oppose him to the utmost. At Cæsarea, where he embarked, he found Sabinus, the Procurator of Syria, who had come for the purpose of confiscating the property of Herod. He was ordered back by Varus, but as soon as he and Archelaus were out of the way Sabinus marched to Jerusalem, took possession of the city, and began to seize the treasures and fortified places.

When Archelaus arrived at Rome he found his brother Herod Antipas ready to oppose his claims, supported by a powerful party, assisted by Salome and several members of Herod the Great's family, who favoured the pretensions of Antipas, not so much from regard to him as from hatred to Archelaus. They were all opposed to a regal government in Judea, but if they were compelled to have a king, they agreed to prefer Herod Antipas. Augustus listened to the claims of both parties, and deferred his judgment till he more thoroughly examined the matter. During the absence of Archelaus some serious disturbances took place in Judea, and the whole country was in commotion against the Romans. Varus, however, succeeded in quelling the rebellion, and permitted the Jews to send an embassy of fifty persons to Rome; and when they arrived in the imperial city, they were joined by some thousands of Roman Jews. When the Jews were admitted to the Emperor's presence, they complained of the tyranny of Herod, accused Archelaus of putting to death three thousand of their countrymen before his departure, and entreated Augustus to unite Palestine with Syria, and make it a Roman province. Archelaus was heard in reply, and in a few days afterwards the Emperor confirmed him in one half of his father's kingdom, including Judea, Idumea, and Samaria, under the title of *ethnarch*, or governor of a nation, with a promise of conferring upon him that of king as soon as he had shown himself worthy of the distinction. St Matthew indeed says that "Archelaus did reign in Judea"—an expression to which there can be no objection, because his father had appointed him his successor with the regal title, and Josephus, notwithstanding the limitation of Augustus, calls him the *king* who succeeded Herod, and so designates him during the time of his government.

When Archelaus took possession of his ethnarchy, he was opposed by a young Jew of Sidon, who pretended that he was Alexander the son of Mariamne, to whom

he bore a strong resemblance, but he was compelled by Augustus to acknowledge himself an impostor, and he was sent to the galleys. The ethnarch soon began to betray signs of an arbitrary and vindictive temper after his return to Jerusalem. He deposed Joazar from the office of high priest, and elevated Eleazar, the brother of Joazar, but as this was done at the request of the people, it must be viewed as a compliance with the popular feeling. In other respects his reign was extremely tyrannical, and he seems to have been the worst of all Herod's sons, with the exception of Antipater. He evinced little regard for the Mosaic Law, for he repudiated his wife Mariamne, and married Glaphyra, the widow of his brother Alexander, though she had several children by her former marriage. At length, in the tenth year of his government, supposed about A.D. 10 or 12, his subjects presented grievous complaints of his cruelty and tyranny to Augustus. He was summoned to Rome with his accusers, and the Emperor, having heard both the charge and the defence, condemned him to be banished to Gaul, and all his property to be confiscated. Judea was now reduced to a province, and annexed to Syria, and Publius Sulpicius Quirinus, called Cyrenius in the Gospel, was appointed Procurator. Archelaus died in exile at Vienna.

ARCHIPPUS, mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians, is generally supposed to be the same specified in the Epistle to Philemon. He served as a deacon in the Church of Colosse, and the Apostle thus addresses him, "Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it." Some suppose that these words convey a rebuke to Archippus for negligence in the performance of his duties, but others are of opinion that the Apostle intended to encourage him to diligence, and to oppose the false teachers at Colosse, who were active in spreading their errors; and this latter opinion is more agreeable to the manner in which he is noticed in the

Epistle to Philemon, written about this time. It is contended that he was afterwards bishop of Colosse, but he is also described as bishop of Laodicea in Phrygia. The Greeks observe his festival on the 22d November, and the Romans on the 22d of March. The former maintain that he suffered martyrdom at Colosse.

ARETAS, a name common to a succession of Arabian princes, one of whom was in possession of Damascus when St Paul began to preach the gospel there after his conversion, and was persecuted by the Jews. They prevailed upon the governor to keep the gates shut day and night, to prevent the escape of the Apostle, but he happily avoided their snares. Herod Antipas married a daughter of this Aretas, but he afterwards chose to divorce her, and took his sister-in-law Herodias. Aretas in consequence declared war, and entirely defeated him.

ARISTARCHUS, a disciple and companion of St Paul, who accompanied him to Ephesus where his life was in danger, and he followed him in his subsequent travels. He was a native Jew of Thessalonica, though he is mentioned as a Macedonian. He was the Apostle's fellow-labourer and fellow-prisoner, Acts xix. 29; xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10, 11; Philemon 24. In the Roman Martyrology he is styled bishop of Thessalonica, but the Greeks allege that he was bishop of Apamea in Syria, and was beheaded with St Paul at Rome under the Emperor Nero.

ARISTOBULUS, an Alexandrian Jew mentioned in the Second Book of the Maccabees, who was "of the stock of the anointed priests," and to whom Judas Maccabæus sends letters of congratulation. He was preceptor to Ptolemy Euergetes, and flourished about one hundred and fifty years before the Christian era. Eusebius alleges that he was a favourite of Ptolemy, and cites from his "Commentaries on the Books of Moses," inscribed to that prince, several verses of Orpheus, in which are mentioned Abraham and Moses. These

verses are also found in Justin Martyr, but so much altered that their authenticity has been denied. He is said to have either invented the story of the manner in which the Septuagint version was executed, or to have borrowed it from Aristæus; and Clement of Alexandria alleges that he endeavoured to ascribe the Grecian philosophy to a Hebrew origin, and to assert that Pythagoras, Plato, and other ancient philosophers, were acquainted with the Mosaic Law.

ARISTOBULUS, mentioned by St Paul, is alleged by the modern Greeks to have been one of the Seventy Disciples, and brother of Barnabas, and that he was sent into Britain, where he preached the gospel, and died. Others doubt whether he was a Christian, as St Paul does not salute him, but those only of his household.

ARPHAXAD, the third son of Shem, was distinguished above the rest of his brethren by having the Patriarchal line continued through him. He has been claimed as the founder of the Chinese Empire. Some Mahometan authors make him both a prophet and apostle, and lodge the chief sovereignty over all the nations of the world in his descendants.

ARPHAXAD, king of Media, so called in the Apocryphal Book of Judith (i. 1), is supposed to be Deioces, the king of Media, and founder of Ecbatana, now called Hamadan. He is represented in the Book of Judith as having been utterly defeated by Nebuchodonosor, who took Ecbatana, and destroyed its walls and buildings.

ARSACES, mentioned by the author of the First Book of the Maccabees as king of Media and Persia, who took prisoner Demetrius Nicator, king of Syria, is supposed by Dr Prideaux to be Mithridates, who treated Demetrius with great hospitality, and gave him one of his daughters in marriage. The family of the *Arsacids* commenced with Arsaces I., the founder of the Parthian monarchy, which proved an impenetrable barrier to the Romans in all their attempts to extend their dominions eastward.

ARTAXERXES, the name of several kings of Persia mentioned in the canonical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, in the Apocryphal Books of Esdras, and the Greek additions to the Book of Esther. The Artaxerxes of Ezra and Nehemiah, surnamed Longimanus, is the Ahasuerus of Esther. The Scriptures notice him more than any other Persian king. See AHASUERUS.

ARTEMAS, a disciple of St Paul mentioned in his Epistle to Titus (iii. 12), of whom nothing is known.

ASA, the son of Abijam, king of Judah, succeeded his father, B.C. 955. He ascended the throne two years before the death of Jeroboam, and as he was then very young, the affairs of the kingdom were administered by his mother, who encouraged idolatry to the utmost of her power. But as soon as Asa assumed the government, he became zealous in the establishment and maintenance of true religion; he demolished the altars erected to idols, and punished such as were addicted to idolatry. He adopted every means to put his kingdom in the best possible condition, which the peace he enjoyed during the first ten years of his reign enabled him to do, and his people increased so much that he was enabled to bring into the field an army of 580,000 men. In the eleventh year of his reign, he attacked and defeated the numerous host of Zerah, king of the Arabian and Ethiopian Cush, who had penetrated through Arabia Petraea into the Valley of Zephathah. The Prophet Azariah declared this victory to be in consequence of Asa's reliance upon Jehovah, which induced him to abolish all the remnants of idolatry he could discover, and to cause all his people to renew their covenant with God. Yet when Baasha, king of Israel, took from him the city of Ramah, and was fortifying it as a frontier barrier, he employed the wealth of the Temple and of his own treasury to procure the assistance of the king of Damascus, whom he induced to attack Baasha. By this means he regained Ramah, but he squandered his treasures—a circumstance which

he appears to have bitterly regretted, along with the consciousness that he was in error, for when the Prophet Hanani reproved him for his conduct, and his distrust of Jehovah, he was imprisoned by Asa's order. In the last years of his life he treated some of his subjects with great severity. He reigned forty-one years, and was succeeded by his son Jehoshaphat.

ASAHEL, brother of Joab, the son of Zeruiah, who is noticed "as light of foot as a wild roe." In the early history of all nations such physical endowments as strength and swiftness made their possessors extremely popular, more so than exhibiting remarkable mental distinctions. Among these personal accomplishments that of swiftness was greatly esteemed by the Hebrews. He was killed by Abner, whom he keenly pursued on foot after the battle, in which Ishbosheth's army, commanded by Abner himself, was defeated. He was warned by Abner to desist from following him, but he refused, and "Abner, with the hinder end of the spear, smote him under the fifth rib, that the spear came out behind him." Asahel was buried in Bethlehem, and Joab shortly afterwards revenged his death by treacherously assassinating Abner. There are persons named Asahel mentioned in the Scriptures of whom nothing is known, Sam. xxiii. 24; 1 Chron. xi. 26; 2 Chron. xvii. 8; xxxi. 13; Ezra x. 15.

ASAPH, the son of Berechiah, of the tribe of Levi, was a celebrated musician in the time of David, who presided over the music in the Temple, and whose descendants or successors, the "sons of Asaph," continued to superintend that department of the public service. Several of the Psalms have the name of Asaph prefixed to them, but it is not certain whether the words or the music might be composed by him; and some of them, which were written during the Babylonish Captivity, cannot be ascribed to him in any sense.

ASENATH, the daughter of Potiphar, priest of On, was given in marriage to Joseph, when he was made prime

minister of Egypt. She was the mother of Ephraim and Manasseh. Some of the Jews pretend that she was the daughter of Potiphar, who thrust Joseph into prison, but this conceit is unsupported by any evidence.

ASSHUR, the son of Shem, of whom it is said, in reference to the country of Shinar, "out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city of Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah." The marginal reading is, "Out of that land he (Nimrod) went forth into Assyria," and the form of expression in Hebrew gives equal authority to both renderings. From the text it appears that Asshur, when driven out of Shinar by Nimrod, went and settled in Assyria, to which he is said to have given his name; while the other reading makes Nimrod extend his encroachments on the Shemites by appropriating Assyria also, or that he relinquished his kingdom in Shinar for some unknown reason, and founded another in Assyria. It is not known whether Asshur or Nimrod founded Nineveh, and it does not appear to have been a place of consequence until some centuries afterwards.

ATHALIAH, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, whom Jehoram, the son and successor of Jehoshaphat, married during his father's lifetime, and consequently with his approbation. Through her influence all the brothers of the king were murdered, and idolatry was openly patronized and encouraged. Athaliah was the mother of Ahaziah, also called Jehoahaz, who succeeded his father, and suffered himself to be entirely guided by his wicked counsels. He was killed by Jehu while visiting Jehoram, king of Israel, who lay wounded in his summer palace at Jezreel, and as soon as Athaliah heard at Jerusalem that her son was slain, she took possession of the throne, and murdered all the males of the royal family, with the exception of Joash, the youngest son of Ahaziah, who, being then an infant, was providentially rescued by his aunt Jehosheba, and privately

brought up by a nurse in an apartment of the Temple. Athaliah reigned more than six years. When she was put to death, the idolatry introduced by her was abolished, and the young prince was publicly anointed king in the Temple.

ATTALUS, the name of several kings of Pergamus. The Attalus mentioned in the First Book of the Maccabees (xv. 22), to whom the Romans wrote in favour of the Jews, was surnamed Philadelphus, and governed the kingdom instead of his nephew, Attalus III.

AUGUSTUS CÆSAR, the nephew of Julius Cæsar, was Emperor of the world, as the Roman Empire was frequently designated, when our Saviour appeared. He was one of the most illus-

trious men whom any age produced; but as he is not particularly connected with the New Testament history, it would be superfluous to give any account of his great actions and eventful reign, as the second of the Imperial Cæsars, in the present work. All the Roman Emperors claimed the name of Augustus as well as Cæsar, which explains the allusion of Festus in his address to Agrippa respecting St Paul, Acts xxv. 21.

AZARIAH, otherwise UZZIAH, king of Judah, succeeded his father Amaziah, B.C. 809. See UZZIAH. There are many high priests and other persons of this name, which seems to have been common among the Hebrews, mentioned in the Scriptures, and in Jewish history.

B

BAALIS, a king of the Ammonites mentioned by the Prophet Jeremiah, who concerted with Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, to kill Gedaliah, with a view of making those Jews who still remained in their country his slaves.

BAASHA, the third king of the Ten Tribes, succeeded Nadab the son of Jeroboam, whom he had murdered in the second year of his reign, in fulfilment of the prediction of the Prophet Abijah, that the whole race of Jeroboam would be cut off. Baasha reigned twenty-four years, and fixed his chief residence at Tirzah. He did not reform the abuses of Jeroboam, and the Prophet Jehu was sent to inform him of the determination of Jehovah to cut off his family. This was fulfilled in the second year of the reign of his son Elah, who was murdered with all his father's family by Zimri.

BALAAM, the son of Beor or Bosor, was a native of Pethor, a very ancient town on the banks of the Euphrates. Being a prophet, Balak, king of the Moabites, sent for him to curse the Israelites, who were then in their progress under Moses to the Promised Land.

The Moabite messengers arrived at the place of his residence, accompanied by a similar deputation from the Midianites, with suitable rewards to induce Balaam to accede to their king's request. It appears that the Moabites placed great dependence on the opinion of Balaam, whom they viewed as a diviner of the first order, and whose reputation had been widely spread throughout that region. "I wot," said Balak by his messengers, "that he whom thou blessest is blessed, and he whom thou cursest is cursed." It was an opinion very extensively prevalent throughout the world in different ages, and it is even yet cherished by the barbarous and half-civilized nations of Africa and Asia, that there were persons who could exercise the power, by the performance of certain rites, of devoting others to inevitable destruction, and of bringing a curse upon entire armies. Examples occur in ordinary history, as well as in the Scriptures, of individuals and collective bodies being thus put under bann or curse, which was done sometimes by words of imprecation, and at other times it was preceded by or con-

ected with particular rites and sacrifices.

When the deputies informed Balaam of the nature of their mission he made no special objection, but simply requested them to remain with him till the next day, and he would then be able to tell them if it was in his power to accompany them. From what follows in the narrative of the inspired historian it appears that Balaam, though personally a bad man, spoke by inspiration, and was acquainted with, if he did not always practise, the worship of the true God. A Divine communication announced to him that he was on no account to go to Balak with the deputies of the Moabites, and accordingly on the morning he intimated to them that he could not accompany them. The deputies instantly returned to Balak, and informed him that Balaam would not comply with his request.

But this refusal, in conjunction with his own fears, made the king of Moab more anxious to see the Prophet, and he sent another deputation, composed of persons of higher rank than the former, with a most pressing request that he would immediately repair to him, adding that he would also "promote him unto very high honour, and do whatsoever he said unto him." These offers were doubtless tempting to Balaam, whose mind appears to have been of the most sordid description, yet he knew the danger he incurred if he opposed himself deliberately to the Divine Will, and also his own utter inability of doing what Balak required of him. He said to the second deputation, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God to do more or less. Now, therefore, I pray you, tarry ye also here this night, that I may know what the Lord will say unto me more." For his own wise and inscrutable purposes Jehovah gave him permission to accompany the Moabites. It was announced to him, "If the men come to call thee, rise up, and go with them; but yet the word which I shall say unto thee that thou shalt do."

Balaam, overjoyed at the prospect of a reward from Balak, and pleased that he was permitted so far to follow his own inclinations, embraced with alacrity the Divine permission; he "rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and went with the princes of Moab." No sooner had he departed than "God's anger was kindled because he went," by which we are to understand not simply *because he went*, for he had been told to go, but because his sordid disposition made him too willing. He had been directed to go if the deputies "came to call him;" but it appears that he did not wait their calling, and that he rose and expressed his readiness to go with them. On this occasion that remarkable incident occurred which is very minutely narrated by the inspired historian. At a particular part of the road, as he was riding on his ass, with two servants behind him, a mysterious messenger stood in the way with a drawn sword in his hand, invisible to Balaam, but seen by the animal on which he rode. In terror the ass diverged from the path into the open country or field, and this enraged Balaam to such a degree that he struck the animal with great severity. It appears that the angel retired for a little, and the ass recovering its composure proceeded onwards, carrying Balaam until the party came to a narrow part of the road, most probably cut through the solid rock—such defiles being common in that region, which is described as having a "wall on this side and a wall on that side," when the angel again appeared in a threatening and alarming attitude. The animal reared, and, in the act of turning, pushed against the rocky side of the narrow path, and bruised the Prophet's foot against it. Balaam, now doubly irritated and smarting with pain, inflicted a second punishment on the animal for what he considered its freaks and obstinacy. The angel once more "went forward, and stood in a narrow place, where was no way to turn either to the right hand or to the left." The affrighted animal, as if conscious that retreat was impossible,

now fell down in terror with its rider, and Balaam a third time struck it with increased severity and cruelty. We are told that "the Lord opened the mouth of the ass," and here followed the extraordinary expostulation between the animal and its rider which Moses narrates, when "the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand; and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face." The mysterious messenger reproved him for his cruelty towards the animal, who by its sudden turning had saved the life of its master. Balaam acknowledged his fault, and confessed himself ignorant that the angel of the Lord stood in the way, professing at the same time his willingness to return if it was the Divine pleasure; but the angel enjoined him to go with the men, intimating, however, that he must speak only what would be dictated to him by Jehovah.

Such is the narrative of this very remarkable incident in the life of Balaam, which, while it has excited no little speculation among pious and learned writers, has been an object of ridicule among sceptics and others. Dr Geddes, in conformity to the free sentiments which he adopted and defended with regard to the Pentateuch, gives it as his opinion that the history of Balaam was not written by Moses, but by the compiler of the Pentateuch from such traditional stories or scraps of written documents as he could find, and also maintains that it "has all the air of a legendary tale." He argues that there appears to him nothing strange in the story of the ass but the manner of telling it, and that it ceases to be wonderful when we recollect the Oriental mode of narrating. Balaam, says this singular writer, is riding on his ass on what is to him a doubtful errand—the ass startles at something, and turns aside from the way—thrusts its master's leg against a wall, and at length falls down under him. All this Balaam interprets as a bad omen, and a sign that his journey is not agreeable to God, whom he

conceives to be angry with him, and an imaginary dialogue ensues between God and Balaam, similar to that which had before been supposed to be held between Balaam and his ass.

Many very serious objections might be urged to these statements of Dr Geddes, in which their utter fallacy could be easily shown, but this is unnecessary in the case of a writer who in the outset denies the authenticity of the whole narrative. It has been also asserted that it was all a fiction of Balaam, to save himself from obloquy if he should bless instead of cursing the Israelites—a most improbable conclusion, when we recollect that Balaam was expressly told that he would be unable to speak in any other way than that dictated to him, and his previous declaration that he could not even go to Balak until he received Divine permission. One remarkable feature in the narrative is, that Balaam uttered no expression of astonishment when the animal addressed him in articulate sounds, but replied with the utmost composure. This has induced some writers to conjecture that the dialogue between Balaam and the ass was transacted in a trance or vision, because he, like the other ancient prophets, was accustomed to revelations, which he received in visions and dreams. Proceeding on this assumption, Dr Jortin admits that an angel of God really opposed Balaam in the way, and suffered himself to be seen by the beast, but not by the Prophet—that the ass was terrified, and Balaam struck it, and immediately fell into a trance, and in that state he conversed with the animal first and then with the angel, when the angel presented these objects to his imagination as strongly as if they had been before his eyes, so that it was still a miraculous operation.

To cite all the opinions and conjectures which have been advanced on this or other preternatural occurrences recorded by the sacred writers, would only be tedious, and probably unsatisfactory. If it is admitted that the history of Balaam is an authentic and undoubted part of the

inspired narrative, which has never been denied except by men of sceptical principles, we ought ever to recollect the admirable definition of St Paul, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness." Nor is this passage of Balaam's history without those salutary lessons, for the Prophet was severely reproofed for his cruelty towards the unoffending animal, while he was no less sharply censured for the selfish and worldly notions which influenced him when he set out with the Moabites. This is evidently what St Peter urges in his description of those who "have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness, but was rebuked for his iniquity, the dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the Prophet." On this subject Bishop Newton offers the following observations in his *Dissertations on the Prophecies*:—"The speaking ass from that time to this hath been the standing jest of every infidel brother. Maimonides and others have conceived that the matter was transacted in a vision, but it appears rather more probable, from the whole tenor of the narrative, that this was no visionary but a real transaction. The words of St Peter show that it is to be understood as he himself understood it literally, 2 Pet. ii. 14-15. The ass was enabled to utter such and such sounds, probably as parrots do, without understanding them; and say what you will of the construction of the ass's mouth, of the formation of the tongue and jaws being unfit for speaking, yet an adequate cause is assigned for this wonderful effect; for it is said expressly that 'the Lord opened the mouth of the ass,' and no one who believes in a God can doubt of his power of doing this and much more. The miracle was by no means needless or superfluous: it was very proper to convince Balaam that the mouth and tongue were

Divine power which caused the dumb ass to speak contrary to its nature, could make him in like manner utter blessings contrary to his inclination."

This remarkable incident appears to have had its intended effect on the mind of Balaam, for when Balak, when he heard of his arrival in his territories, went out to meet him, and reproached the Prophet for not complying with his first request, the latter unhesitatingly intimated to him that it was still probable that he could be of no service to him. "Lo, I am come unto thee," he said; "have I now any power at all to say any thing? The word that God putteth in my mouth that shall I speak."

The king of Moab carried Balaam to his capital, Kirjath-huzoth, which literally signifies a *city of streets*, where he offered a sacrifice of oxen and sheep according to the idolatrous rites which he practised. On the following day he took the Prophet to a high place, from which he could obtain an extensive view of the Hebrews in their encampments on the plain beneath. Here Balaam told the king to build seven altars, and to prepare seven oxen and seven rams. These directions, connected with the mystical number *seven*, strongly indicate attempts at magic and incantation, for Israel had only one altar for sacrifice, nor could more than one have been necessary for any real purpose which Balaam had in view, except that of working on the king's superstitious fears. The Prophet told Balak to remain near his burnt-offering while he privately retired to a solitary place, there to ascertain what answer he was to give him. When he returned to the king, who was still standing near the burnt-sacrifice with his leading men, Balaam "took up his parable," and broke forth into an impassioned burst of eloquent prophecy in favour of the Hebrews, uttered in language most sublime and poetical—"How shall I curse," he exclaimed, "whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy, whom God hath not defied?" He concluded by uttering the memorable prayer, which, however, was

not to be granted to this remarkable, and, it may be added, depraved man—"Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!"

Balak heard the mystic seer with astonishment. A blessing was pronounced instead of a curse, and he could not restrain his indignation. "What hast thou done unto me? I took thee to curse mine enemies, and behold thou hast blessed them altogether." The Prophet gave him to understand that he could not utter what he pleased, and that he must speak only what the Lord put into his mouth. Balak then proposed that they should go to another eminence, from which Balaam would have a different view of the Hebrew encampment, where he would see only "the utmost part," but not the whole. Here we have an evident intimation of superstitious feelings working on his alarmed and excited mind. He thought that there might be some presiding invisible power which rendered the first eminence unpropitious, and he resolved to choose what he considered would be a favourable locality. They accordingly proceeded to the top of Pisgah, and built there seven altars, on which they offered sacrifices similar to those on the former occasion. Balaam again retired apart, and when he returned the king anxiously inquired "what the Lord had spoken." We are not to infer from this mention of the true God that Balak had any knowledge of his attributes or his nature, but he certainly revered the Deity, when he saw the Prophet consulting in the same manner as he would have done any superior power whom he considered able to injure or protect him. But his distress was increased by what was again announced to him. Balaam "took up his parable" in the same lofty and poetical manner.—"Rise up, Balak, and hear; hearken unto me, thou son of Zippor. God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent. Hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good? Behold I have received commandment to bless, and he

hath blessed, and I cannot reverse it." He then proceeded to announce the peculiar favour which was vouchsafed by Jehovah to the Hebrews, and concluded by uttering a fine prediction of their then condition and future happiness, intimating that he saw in Israel none of those idolatrous vanities in which other nations were immersed, and that he attributed their safety to that circumstance. That this was his real opinion is evident from the advice which he subsequently gave to the Midianites, informing them that the way to effect the ruin of the Israelites was to seduce them into idolatry.

Balak, now in a state of despair, repented that he had taken any steps in this singular affair, and he entreated Balaam to calm his troubled mind on almost any terms. "Neither," said he, "curse them at all, nor bless them at all." The Prophet, however, still reminded him of his own peculiar situation, and that it was impossible for him to say any thing except what was dictated to him by Jehovah. Bishop Horsley and other distinguished commentators are inclined to place somewhere in this part of the narrative a conversation between Balak and Balaam, which is omitted by the sacred historian, but supplied by the Prophet Micah (vi. 5-8). The sixth and seventh verses of the chapter just referred to are to be read as questions put to Balaam by Balak, as if inquiring in what way he might make expiation for his offences. "Wherewith," he asks Balaam, "shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" The eighth verse is to be held as the reply of Balaam:—"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? The Lord's voice crieth unto the city, and the man of wisdom shall see thy

name; hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it." The conjecture that the conversation now cited actually took place between Balak and Balaam, which Moses omitted as foreign to the subject of his history, but which the Israelites ought to have remembered, is supported by the authority of the Prophet Micah himself, for he introduces it in these express words, "O my people, remember now what Balak king of Moab consulted, and what Balaam the son of Beor answered him from Shittim unto Gilgal," namely, from the encampment of their ancestors in the plains of Moab, near Shittim, east of Jordan, where they sinned, and deserved to be cut off (Numb. xxv. 3-18), until their encampment at Gilgal on the other side of Jordan in the Land of Canaan. From this remarkable conversation, therefore, supplied by the Prophet Micah, and in fact from his whole history, it is evident that Balaam's religion was ostensibly and professedly that of the Patriarchs, and that he despised the idolatrous system which prevailed around him, while at the same time his conduct, like that of many since his day, was not in conformity to his belief.

The king resolved to make a third trial, and Balaam willingly concurred. They proceeded to another mountain, and on the top of Peor they erected seven altars, and offered a bullock and a ram on every altar. We have a very remarkable notice of Balaam's proceedings on this third occasion, which throws considerable light on his character. The inspired historian informs us that "when Balaam saw that it pleased the Lord to bless Israel, he went not, as at other times, to seek for enchantments, but he set his face towards the wilderness." This implies that he had hitherto used, or pretended to use, certain magical arts, to impress Balak that he was inclined to serve him, but now he gave himself up entirely to the Divine direction and resorted no more to his incantations. He "lifted up his eyes," and he beheld the Hebrews dwelling in their encampments, unconscious of what was transacting

between himself and Balak. We are told that he "took up his parable," in which he designated himself "the man whose eyes are open"—now enlightened, though once obstinately and wilfully blind—and commenced a glowing description of the future happiness of the Hebrews. "How goodly are thy tents, O Israel!" This probably referred to the beautiful arrangement of the camps as seen from the mountain, which seems to have excited the strong and finely expressed admiration of Balaam on this occasion. He concluded his prediction with the emphatic words, "Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee."

All this was pronounced in Balak's presence, and the rage and despair of the king were unbounded. He upbraided the Prophet for his conduct, which he began to think was intentional—he reminded him that he had called him to curse his enemies, and instead thereof he had blessed them three several times; he therefore advised him to betake himself to his own residence as speedily as possible, telling him that the honours and rewards he had intended for him had been kept from him "by the Lord." But the Prophet appeared in no way intimidated by Balak's invectives. He reminded him of what he had told his messengers at the outset:—"Spake I not, saying, If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of mine own mind, but what the Lord saith, that I will speak? And now, behold, I go unto my people; come, therefore, and I will advertise thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days." He commenced by predicting that "there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre out of Israel," alluding to a future eminent king and ruler of the Hebrews, who would "smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." This, as Bishop Newton observes, was done by David, when he destroyed two thirds of that people, and saved one third alive,

and "so the Moabites became David's servants, and brought gifts," 2 Sam. viii. 2. He announced also the fate of the Amalekites, then "the first of the nations" who warred against the Hebrews, that they would "perish for ever," and that of the Kenites, that, though they were strong in their dwelling-place, and put their "nest in a rock," they would be wasted until Asshur, otherwise Assyria, should carry them away captive. The other particulars of this remarkable prophecy were also literally accomplished.

Balaam now departed as he had been commanded by Balak—his prophecies were uttered, the design of Jehovah was fulfilled, and the instrument was now thrown aside. It is said that "he went to his place," while Balak, who probably left him in indignation and despair, did not offer to inflict upon him any personal ill treatment. Balaam was now left entirely to pursue his own schemes of ambition. It may be inferred from the statement, "he went to his place," that he proceeded to his own country of Mesopotamia, but if he did so it is plain that he soon returned. It is more probable, however, that he halted among the Midianites, after setting out with the intention of returning to his native country, yet if he actually went home, there seemed sufficient inducement to come back from such a considerable distance as the Euphrates, after he had been informed of the success of the advice he had given to the Midianites on his way, which he knew would be as destructive to the Hebrews as if he had been permitted to curse them. According to Josephus, he informed the king that he could never subdue the Israelites unless they were disobedient to their God, and he suggested to him the manner in which he could make them the objects of Divine vengeance. This account is confirmed by Moses, who says that Balaam "caused the Israelites to commit trespass against the Lord." The Hebrews were enticed by the Moabitish women, and female influence made them embrace their idolatry. It is the opinion of the

Hebrew writers, that when Balaam heard that the Israelites had fallen into the snare he had laid for them, he never doubted that they would be easily defeated, and hastened back to obtain a share of the spoil; but others assert that when he heard of the plague which had swept away so many thousands of the Hebrews, he returned to claim the reward of his iniquity from the princes of Moab. However this may be, in the destruction of the Midianites which ensued, when five of their princes fell, Balaam was also slain "with the sword." Such was the melancholy end of a man who recently exclaimed with heartfelt sincerity, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!"

The Hebrews admit that Balaam knew the true God, erected altars to him, and was a true prophet, though corrupted by avarice—a view which is supported by Jerome, Augustine, and other commentators. Others, however, advance several opinions—that he was an egregious impostor, and made a public traffic of his pretended art—that his whole power consisted in magic and cursing—that he did not consult the Lord, but was supernaturally inspired, and constrained to speak against his own inclination—that he was a magician, an idolater, and a false prophet, who spoke truth against his will—and that he was like Caiaphas, who prophesied without understanding what he uttered. The Rabbins also relate that he was at first one of Pharaoh's councillors—that he was the father of the two Egyptian magicians Jannes and Jambres—that he was lame, and that he squinted—and some allege that he wrote the account of himself in the Book of Numbers, which Moses inserted, as he is alleged to have done other writings. But it is evident from the whole tenor of the inspired narrative, and from the impression left on the mind of every person who peruses it, that the opinion of the Hebrew writers is the correct one, and Balaam is introduced as one of those who "knew his Master's will and did it not." Dr Hales well observes that the "history of this

prophet furnishes a deplorable and an alarming instance of the deceitfulness of the human heart. He could not forego the *rewards of divination* and the allurements of ambition. He first sought permission to go to Balak, wishing to gratify that prince after he had been refused by God and told expressly, *Thou shalt not go, thou shalt not curse the people, for they are blessed.* He sought to prevail with God by solicitations and sacrifices to alter his purposes. When these failed, and he had thrice blessed the people, he sinned yet more against the whole meaning, end, and design of the prohibition; for surely that mischievous counsel to seduce the Israelites into idolatry was in fact a greater piece of wickedness and impiety than if he had formally cursed them in words. Still, his partial regard to his duty seems to have quieted his conscience, otherwise how could he expect that, while he did not live the life of the righteous, he could be entitled to his peaceful death and joyful resurrection? And accordingly his ill-founded wish was frustrated, for he was cut off by the avenging sword of the Israelites, in reward for his pernicious counsels, along with his licentious abettors."

BALAK, the son of Zippor, and king of Moab in the time of Moses, whose transactions are mentioned in the preceding account of Balaam. No other particulars of his life are preserved, and the time or the manner of his death is not known. It appears from a passage in the Book of Judges, that he offered no violence to the Israelites after his affair with Balaam. Jephthah sent a deputation to the king of the Ammonites, who were instructed to say to him among other things, "And now art thou any thing better than Balak, the son of Zippor, king of Moab? did he ever strive against Israel, or did he ever fight against them?"

BARABBAS, a criminal whose release from prison at the feast of the Passover was preferred by the wretched Jews to that of the blessed Saviour of the world, who "did no sin, neither was guile found

in his mouth," who "went about continually doing good," and who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." Barabbas was a robber, and had been imprisoned for being concerned in an insurrection or sedition in Jerusalem, in which murder had been committed. We are told that at the feast of the Passover the governor was "wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would." This custom, which also prevailed among some other nations on particular occasions, seems to have been introduced by the Roman governors as an act of grace to obtain popularity. Barabbas was released by Pilate in compliance with the demand of the wretched and infuriated Jews, who in this transaction exhibited a remarkable instance of frantic passion.

BARACHIAS, a person mentioned by our Saviour in the woes he denounced against the Pharisees as the father of Zacharias, who is supposed to be the last of the Prophets whose death is recorded in the Old Testament.

BARAK, the general commissioned by Deborah to oppose Sisera, the commander of Jabin's army. This heroic female accompanied him to the banks of the river Kishon, he having positively assured her that he would not march without her. Barak was at the head of 10,000 men, and with this force he gave battle to Sisera, whose army was infinitely more numerous, and who had in addition nine hundred chariots of iron, whereas the Hebrew soldiers were all on foot. Nevertheless Sisera was completely defeated, and was compelled to save himself by flight. He was pursued by Barak, and by the time the Hebrew general came up he had been killed by Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, into whose tent the unfortunate Canaanite had been invited to rest and refresh himself. The triumphal ode sung by him and Deborah on the occasion of the defeat of Sisera is justly reckoned one of the finest specimens of Hebrew poetry. Barak is honourably mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews among those who through faith

"waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of the aliens." No other particulars are recorded of his life in the Scriptures.

BAR-JESUS, or the *son of Jesus*, otherwise *Joshua*, a Jewish sorcerer or false prophet, whom St Paul and Barnabas encountered at the town of Paphos in the island of Cyprus. This man was also called *Elymas*, a name derived from an Arabic word signifying a *magician*. As it pleased God to invest the Apostles and the first preachers of the Gospel with the power of confirming the truth of the Christian revelation by signs and miracles, some of the Jews, who opposed Christianity, also pretended to be prophets, and to work miracles by magical arts. It happened that Sergius Paulus, the Roman Proconsul, whom the Evangelical writer characterises as "a prudent man," requested St Paul and Barnabas to attend him, and explain to him the doctrines of Christianity—a religion of which he had often heard, but of which he knew nothing. The Apostle and his companion willingly complied, but this Bar-Jesus, or Elymas, afraid that the Proconsul would yield to the force of St Paul's arguments, endeavoured to oppose him. We are not told precisely what means he employed, and it is simply said that he "withstood" the Apostle, and sought to "turn away the Deputy from the faith." It is evident, however, that he must have said or done something very offensive, which provoked the severe and humiliating punishment inflicted on him. St Paul, "filled with the Holy Ghost," thus addressed him, "O full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the ways of the Lord? And now, behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season." This was immediately done as the Apostle intimated—there "fell on him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand." The Proconsul, astonished at this striking display of Divine Power exhibited by one of the

most distinguished assertors of Christianity, became a convert to the truth of the gospel.

BAR-JONA, the *son of Jonas*, a surname applied by our Saviour to St Peter, in conjunction with his other name of Simon, after his confession that he believed him to be "the Christ, the Son of the living God." Simon Bar-Jona is equivalent to Simon, son of Jonas, as St Peter was addressed on an important occasion by our Saviour before his ascension—"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?"

BARNABAS, a distinguished preacher of Christianity, and coadjutor of the Apostles, whom St Luke describes as a "good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith," was a Levite Jew of the island of Cyprus. Some of the primitive writers have supposed that he was at first one of the Seventy Disciples, whom our Saviour invested with a peculiar commission during his personal ministry, but this is a mere conjecture. He was one of those who soon after the ascension of Christ sold their property, and laid the money at the feet of the Apostles. His original name seems to have been Joseph, and the appellation of *Barnabas*, or the *son of consolation*, by which he is known in the Evangelical narrative, was conferred upon him by the Apostles.

Barnabas presented St Paul to the Apostles three years after his memorable conversion, and he appears to have been early invested with apostolical authority, for we find him commissioned to proceed to Antioch, and to report concerning the extraordinary success which accompanied the preaching of the gospel in that city. When he arrived at that place, and "had seen the grace of God," we are told that he was "glad, and exhorted them all with purpose of heart to cleave unto the Lord." He then went to meet St Paul at Tarsus, and returned with him to Antioch, where they both resided one year, and were entrusted with the alms sent to the church of Jerusalem for the support of the Christians there. This was in A.D. 44. When they had "fulfilled

their ministry," namely, when they had deposited in the hands of proper persons the sums they had brought from Antioch for the relief of the members of the church of Jerusalem, they returned to that city, bringing with them "John, whose surname was Mark."

When Barnabas and St Paul returned to Antioch, they were both raised from the inferior order of the ministry, and solemnly set apart to be joint Apostles of the Gentiles. They lost no time in commencing their great mission, and proceeded to Seleucia, a city on the Mediterranean north-west of Antioch, whence they sailed to the island of Cyprus, where they converted the Proconsul, Sergius Paulus, and where Elymas was punished with temporary blindness. They sailed from Paphos, and came to Perga in Pamphylia in Asia Minor, where John, otherwise Mark, who had accompanied them, left them and returned to Jerusalem. From Perga they proceeded to Antioch in Pisidia—a province north of Pamphylia, in the synagogue of which St Paul delivered a most impressive address, which made a powerful impression. The opposition of the Jews, however, compelled them to leave Antioch, and they travelled into Iconium, the chief city of Lycaonia, north-east of Pisidia. They were in like manner compelled to leave Iconium by the persecution of the Jews, who stirred up the citizens against them, and they visited Lystra, Derbe, and other places in the same province. In the former place St Paul cured a man who had never walked from his birth, which so astonished the citizens that they imagined them to be deities, and they designated Barnabas as Jupiter, and St Paul as Mercury, because he was the chief speaker. It was with great difficulty the two Apostles prevented the citizens from offering sacrifices to them, preparations for which were actually made. They remained at Lystra, and were hospitably received, until the appearance of Jewish deputations from the Pisidian Antioch and Iconium, which succeeded in raising a persecution against them, in which St

Paul was the principal sufferer. They proceeded to Derbe, and, nothing daunted by the treatment they had experienced, after preaching the gospel there, they again visited successively Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch of Pisidia, "confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith." They ordained presbyters to serve the several churches, each of his respective one, who were considered next in dignity to the Apostles themselves. They then passed into Pamphylia, and, visiting Perga in their route, they proceeded to Attalia, a seaport in that province, whence they sailed to Antioch in Syria. Here, in a public congregation, they "rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles."

After the return of Barnabas and his illustrious companion to the Syrian Antioch, there arose a keen controversy on the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual. This dispute was begun by some Jewish converts who had travelled to Antioch, and occasioned great distractions in the minds of the people. It was at length resolved to send Barnabas and St Paul to Jerusalem, to lay the whole matter before the Apostles and presbyters. On their way they embraced every opportunity of announcing to the Christian congregations their remarkable success among the Gentiles, and when they addressed the council of Jerusalem they also declared to that Apostolical assembly all the "things that God had done with them," a sufficient proof that, though uncircumcised, they were accepted by God, as well as the Jews with all their legal rites and privileges. This circumstance would doubtless facilitate the result of the debate—that the Gentiles were not under the Law of Moses. Barnabas and his colleague returned to Antioch with the apostolical decree, accompanied by Silas and Judas surnamed Barsabas.

Not long after this St Paul proposed to Barnabas an apostolical visit to and inspection of all the churches and con

gregations in the various countries of the Gentiles which they had already visited. The latter readily assented, and determined to take his cousin Mark with them as coadjutor, but St Paul would not agree to this arrangement, as he had deserted them in Pamphylia during their former journey. This contention became "sharp between them," and they at length agreed to separate, probably in friendship and good will. Barnabas took Mark with him, and went to Cyprus. This is the substance of what is said of this zealous and distinguished governor of the Church in the apostolic writings. Some ancient ecclesiastical traditions relate that he was stoned to death by the Jews of Cyprus at Salamis, and he was buried by Mark in a cave near that city. It is farther alleged that his body was discovered in the reign of the Emperor Zeno, towards the latter end of the fifth century, with the Gospel of St Matthew written in Greek with his own hand upon his breast. He is commemorated by the Church on the 11th of June, called St Barnabas' Day.

A very ancient writing, called the *Catholic Epistle of St Barnabas*, is still extant, the authenticity of which has caused considerable disputes among ecclesiastical authors. Clement of Alexandria and Origen quote it, and among the moderns, we find the names of Du Pin, Cave, Pearson, Wake, Clarke, and other learned men, who contend that it is the genuine epistle of St Barnabas. On the other hand, strong objections have been urged against it by several good writers. Some allege that it was not written by Barnabas—that its spuriousness is evident from the fact that it is not mentioned in any of the ancient catalogues of the sacred books—that it is not cited in Scripture by any of the Fathers—that it was not read in the assemblies of the primitive Christians—and that it contains contradiction, falsehoods, mistakes, and frivolities. Mosheim argues that it was the production of a superstitious Jew, who must have been a person of very different abilities

from the companion of St Paul. Eusebius reckons it among the writings received by some and rejected by others; and Jerome places it among those Apocryphal books not put into the inspired canon on account of the uncertainty of their authors.

This epistle is translated and printed by Archbishop Wake, in his "Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers," and he occupies the seventh chapter of his Preliminary Discourse to discuss the question of its genuineness, which he does with his well known learning and acuteness. The Archbishop argues that it was addressed to the Jews, which accounts for the mystical and allegorical manner in which some parts of it are written. "That which makes it the less to be wondered at," he observes, "is, that the Jews, of which number he was himself originally one, and to whom he wrote, had of long time been wholly addicted to this way of interpreting the Law, and taught men to seek out a spiritual meaning for almost all the ritual commands and ceremonies of it. It was from hence, I suppose, that the most early heretics were so wedded to their mystical interpretations of Scripture, and so much valued themselves upon the account of them, against whose false and impure doctrines our late great critic Dr Hammond supposes St Barnabas to have principally designed his epistle, and therefore, that being to deal with men who valued nothing but such kind of expositions, he was forced to confute them in their own way, both as most suitable to their manners, and most proper either to convince them of their errors, or at least to prevent others, especially the Jewish converts, from falling into them."

Dr Lardner agrees with Archbishop Wake in acknowledging the Epistle to be genuine, and thinks it most probable that it was written by St Barnabas soon after the destruction of Jerusalem. He differs from the Archbishop, however, as to those to whom it was specially directed. He contends that it was addressed to Gentiles, and intended to lessen their respect

for the peculiar rites and institutions of the Mosaic Law, and to show that they were not binding on Christians. The Epistle was written in Greek, in the copies of which the first four sections and a part of the fifth are wanting, but it is entire in an ancient Latin version. It consists of two parts—the first being an exhortation to constancy in the profession of the Christian faith, and pointing out its simplicity without the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish Law, and the second part containing moral instructions. It is altogether a very remarkable piece, and, if not the production of St Barnabas, it is certain that it is of great Christian antiquity. The following quotations will perhaps convey some idea of its contents. The first is from the tenth chapter or section.

“ But why did Moses say, ‘ Ye shall not eat of the swine, neither the eagle, nor the hawk, nor the crow, nor any fish that has not a scale upon him ? ’ I answer, that in the *spiritual* sense he comprehended three doctrines that were to be gathered from thence. Besides which, he says to them in the Book of Deuteronomy, ‘ And I will give my statutes unto this people.’ Wherefore it is not the command of God, that they should not eat these things, but Moses in the Spirit spake unto them. Now, the sow he forbade them to eat, meaning thus much :— thou shalt not join thyself to such persons as are like unto swine, who, whilst they live in pleasure, forget their God, but when any want pinches them, then they know the Lord, as the sow, when she is full, knows not her master, but when she is hungry, she makes a noise, and, being again fed, is silent. Neither, says he, shalt thou eat the eagle, nor the hawk, nor the kite, nor the crow ; that is, thou shalt not keep company with such kind of men as know not how by their labour and sweat to get themselves food, but injuriously ravish away the things of others, and watch how to lay snares for them, when at the same time they appear to live in perfect innocence. Neither, says he, shalt thou eat the lamprey, nor

the polypus, nor the cuttle-fish ; that is, thou shalt not be like such men, by using to converse with them, who are altogether wicked and adjudged to death, for so those fishes are alone accursed, and wallow in the mire, nor swim as other fishes, but tumble in the dirt at the bottom of the deep.—Moses, therefore, speaking as concerning meats, delivered indeed these great precepts to them in the spiritual signification of those commands ; but they, according to the desire of the flesh, understood him as if he had only meant it of meats. And therefore David took aright the knowledge of his threefold command, saying in like manner, ‘ Blessed is the man that hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly’—as the fishes before mentioned in the bottom of the deep in darkness : ‘ nor stood in the way of sinners’—as they who seem to fear the Lord, but yet sin, as the swine—‘ and hath not sat in the seat of the scorers’—as those birds which sit and watch that they may devour. Here you have the Law concerning meat perfectly set forth, and according to the true knowledge of it. But, says Moses, ‘ Ye shall eat all that divideth the hoof and cheweth the cud,’ signifying thereby such an one as, having taken his food, knows him that nourisheth him, and resting upon him, rejoiceth in him. And in this he spake well, having respect to the commandment. What therefore is it that he says ? That we should hold fast to them that fear the Lord, with those who meditate on the command of the word which they have received in their heart, with those that declare the righteous judgments of the Lord, and keep his commandments—in short, with those who know that to meditate is a work of pleasure, and therefore exercise themselves in the word of the Lord. But why might they eat those that cleave the hoof ? Because the righteous liveth in this present world, but his expectation is fixed upon the other. See, brethren, how admirably Moses commanded these things. But how should we thus know all this, and understand it ? We, therefore, under-

standing aright the commandments, speak as the Lord would have us. Wherefore he has circumcised our ears and our hearts, that we might know these things."

The conclusion of the Epistle is in the following manner:—"It is therefore fitting that, learning the just commands of the Lord, we should walk in them, for he who does such things shall be glorified in the kingdom of God. But he that chooses the other part shall be destroyed, together with his works. For this cause there shall be both a resurrection and a retribution. I beseech those who are in high estate among you (if so be you will take the counsel which with a good intention I offer to you), you have those with you towards whom you may do good; do not forsake them. For the day is at hand in which all things shall be destroyed, together with the wicked one. The Lord is near, and his reward is with him. I beseech you, therefore, again and again, be as good lawgivers to one another; continue faithful counsellors to each other, remove from among you all hypocrisy. And may God, the Lord of all the world, give you wisdom, knowledge, counsel, and understanding of his judgments in patience. Be ye taught of God, seeking what it is the Lord requires of you, and doing it, that ye may be saved in the day of judgment. And if there be among you any remembrance of what is good, think of me, meditating upon these things, that both my desire and my watching for you may turn to a good account. I beseech you, I ask it as a favour of you, whilst you are in this beautiful tabernacle of the body, be wanting in none of these things, but without ceasing seek them, and fulfil every command; for these things are fitting, and worthy to be done. Wherefore I have given the more diligence to write unto you according to my ability, that you might rejoice. Farewell, children of light and peace. The Lord of glory and of all grace be with your spirit. Amen."

BARSABAS, a companion of the Apostles, who was selected along with Matthias as worthy of being admitted to

the Apostleship in the room of Judas Iscariot. The election was by lot, and Matthias was chosen. Barsabas is also called Joseph or Joses, and is supposed to have been the brother of St James the Less, because he was, like St James, surnamed *Justus*.

BARSABAS, also called JUDAS, supposed by some to be the brother of the preceding, was chosen, along with Silas, to accompany St Paul and Barnabas from Jerusalem to the Syrian Antioch, carrying with them the decree of the Council of Jerusalem respecting circumcision. If, says Dr Graves, St Paul and St Barnabas alone had been the bearers of the decree, their opposers might perhaps have raised some suspicion of its authenticity and strict correctness. The Council, therefore, sent with them two other preachers of signal reputation and piety, Judas (Barsabas) and Silas, who had never been engaged in the contest, and would therefore be unsuspected vouchers of the sentence pronounced as the decision.

BARTHOLOMEW, one of the Twelve Apostles, is little more than merely named in the Evangelical writings. He is supposed by many to be the same as Nathanael, an "Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile," and one of our Saviour's first disciples. "Accordingly we may observe," says Dr Graves, "that as St John never mentions Bartholomew in the number of the Apostles, so the other Evangelists never take notice of Nathanael, probably because the same person under two different names. And as in John, Philip and Nathanael are joined together in their coming to Christ, so, in the rest of the Evangelists, Philip and Bartholomew are constantly put together without the least variation, for no other reason, I conceive, than because, as they were jointly called to the discipleship, so they are jointly referred to in the Apostolic catalogue, as afterwards we find them joint companions in the writings of the Church. But that which renders the thing most specious and probable is, that we find Nathanael particularly reckoned

up with the other Apostles to whom our Lord appeared at the Sea of Tiberias after his resurrection, where there were together Simon Peter, and Thomas, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the two sons of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples, who probably were Andrew and Philip. That by *disciples* is here meant *Apostles*, is evident partly from the names of those that are reckoned up, and partly because it is said that *this was the third time Jesus appeared to his disciples*, it being plain that the two foregoing appearances were made to none but the Apostles."

Bartholomew, or Nathanael, if we are to adopt this hypothesis, was a native of Galilee, but no notice is taken of his profession. It is generally supposed that he preached the gospel in some parts of India, and that he carried thither a Hebrew copy of St Matthew's Gospel, where it is said to have been found by Pantænus in the second century. We are, however, informed by an ancient ecclesiastical writer that St Bartholomew dictated the Gospel of St Matthew to the natives from memory, and did not take it along with him. It is also said that he preached in Arabia Felix and Persia, and that, while travelling through the more northern and western parts of Asia, he died on the confines of Armenia, having been flayed alive by order of Astyages, brother of Polemon, king of Armenia, whom he had converted to the Christian religion; but the time, place, and manner of his death cannot be ascertained. Jerome mentions a Gospel of St Bartholomew which Pope Gelasius enumerates among the Apocryphal books. No fragments of this spurious composition are preserved. The Syrians place the fifth seat of ecclesiastical honour at Babylon, in consideration of "Thomas, the Apostle of the Hindoos and Chinese, and of Bartholomew, who is also the Nathanael of the Syrians."

BAR-TIMEUS, or the *son of Timæus*, a blind man who sat on the side of the road to Jericho begging, whom our Saviour restored to sight, at his

earnest entreaty that "Jesus the son of David" would have mercy upon him. This miracle was done before a great concourse of people, and in the presence of the Apostles.

BARUCH, the son of Neriah, was the faithful disciple and attendant of the Prophet Jeremiah. That Prophet received a Divine command while in prison, in the reign of Jehoiachim, king of Judah, to write all his predictions up to that time, and he dictated them to Baruch, by whom they were read to the people in the Temple at the feast of the expiation. He became alarmed at the threats contained in a roll which he had read to the people, but he was encouraged by an assurance that, notwithstanding all the calamities which were to befall Jerusalem and Judah, he would be protected. Usher and Prideaux conjecture that this roll was read to the people a second time in the fifth year of Jehoiachim's reign, after which it was committed to the flames by the king himself, and the Jews, even to this day, in an annual fast commemorate the burning of the roll. Another roll was by the Divine command written from the dictation of Jeremiah by Baruch, which contained a great many additions, and particularly a prophecy against Jehoiachim and his house for the wicked and impious deed he had then committed:—"Therefore, thus saith the Lord of Jehoiachim, king of Judah, He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David, and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost. And I will punish him and his seed and his servants for their iniquity, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and upon the men of Judah, all the evil that I have pronounced against them." We are farther told, however, that this severe denunciation had no effect upon them—they "hearkened not."

In the fourth year of the reign of Zedekiah we find Baruch proceeding to Babylon with his brother Seraiah, and carrying thither a written account of the prophecies contained in the 50th and

51st chapters of the Book of Jeremiah, expressing the judgments which were to be executed upon Chaldea and Babylon by the Medes and Persians. After Baruch had read all these prophecies he threw the roll into the Euphrates, as Jeremiah had commanded him. He accompanied that Prophet into Egypt, and after his death he retired to Babylon, where the Rabbins tell us he died in the twelfth year of the Captivity.

The Apocryphal book of Baruch professes to be an epistle sent by the captive Jews in Babylon to their brethren left in Jerusalem and throughout Judah, in the preface to which it is stated that Baruch, being then at Babylon, drew up this epistle in the name and with the approbation of the king and people, and that a collection having been made, it was sent with the money to Jerusalem. The majority of ancient and modern commentators, and the Protestant Church in general, are of opinion that the Book in question was not written by Baruch, and it is not found in the Hebrew language, but that it is the invention and production of some Hellenistic Jew who assumed the character of Jeremiah's secretary. Dr Gray informs us, that the Book was not received as canonical either by the Jews or by the primitive Church, though it is cited with respect by many of the earlier writers—that it is not mentioned in the catalogue of St Augustine nor in that of the Council of Carthage—that it is expressly excluded with the rest of the Apocryphal books from the catalogue received from their ancestors by the Greek Church—that the members of the Council of Trent were more perplexed, and deliberated longer, about the admission of Baruch, than of any other of the Apocryphal books—and that they were withheld from rejecting it only by the consideration that parts of it were read in the service of their Church. The Book is read in the Roman service at the feast of Pentecost, but many of the best informed Roman Catholic writers do not scruple to reject its authority.

BARZILLAI, an aged and wealthy inhabitant of Rogelim, mentioned among those who contributed liberally to the supplies of David and his soldiers during the rebellion of Absalom. Soon afterwards he had an interview with David, when he was kindly invited to take up his residence at Jerusalem, where he would be held in the highest favour and esteem; but Barzillai excused himself on account of his age, sending Chimham in his stead, and the king "kissed him, and blessed him, and he returned unto his own place." In his last charge to his son Solomon, David thus enjoined him, "Shew kindness unto the sons of Barzillai the Gileadite, and let them be of those that eat at thy table, for so they came to me when I fled because of Absalom thy brother."

BATHSHEBA, the wife of Uriah the Hittite, an officer in David's army commanded by Joab. The king accidentally saw her washing herself, or in the bath, and being struck with her beauty, inquired who she was; and when he was informed, he sent for her to the palace, and a connection ensued, highly dishonourable to both parties, who appear to have mutually yielded to each other's inclination. Uriah was then absent with the army, and Bathsheba at length sent to inform the king that she was pregnant. David sent to Joab ordering him to send Uriah to him instantly, and when he came, after inquiring about the army and the prospects of the war, he enjoined him to proceed to his own home. "Go down to thy house," he said, "and wash thy feet." David knew that detection would have been death to Bathsheba, and his object was to screen the effects of his own and her criminality by persuading Uriah to go home. The urgency of the king might have excited suspicions in Uriah's mind; he did not go to his house, but "slept at the door of the king's house with all the servants of his lord." When David was informed of this he sent for Uriah, and asked him why he did not go to his family. The latter assigned an adequate reason for

his refusal, in the high and honourable sense of military duty which he forcibly expresses. There was now no other way of screening Bathsheba than the death of Uriah, which David procured in the most disgraceful manner, and he took Bathsheba to be his wife. The king, by sincere contrition, acknowledged his bitter sorrow for the crime, but a severe denunciation was uttered by the Prophet Nathan against him for having "given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme." Bathsheba subsequently became the mother of Solomon, whom she had the satisfaction of seeing securely seated on the throne in preference to Adonijah. The time of her death is not mentioned. She greatly irritated Solomon by consenting to procure his sanction for Adonijah to marry Abishag the beautiful Shunammite—a request which caused the king to issue a peremptory order to put his elder brother to death.

BELSHAZZAR, the last king of Babylon of the Chaldean dynasty, is generally admitted to be the Nabonned of Berosus, the Nabonadius of the Canon of Ptolemy, the Labynetus of Herodotus, and the Naboandelus of Josephus. He was the son of Queen Nitocris, and grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. His mother was a politic, active, and resolute princess, who completed the work which Nebuchadnezzar had left unfinished, and in reality governed the empire under her dissipated and thoughtless son, for such is the character of Belshazzar as intimated in the Scriptures, and confirmed by Xenophon. After a reign of seventeen years he was killed on the night when Babylon was stormed by Cyrus, B.C. 538 or 539.

Berosus, who is quoted by Josephus, asserts that Belshazzar, being defeated by Cyrus in battle, escaped to Borsippa, where he surrendered, and was graciously received by Cyrus, who sent him to Carmania, where he was appointed governor. Another authority alleges that one of the eunuchs having heard Daniel's interpretation of the mysterious handwriting on the wall, on the following night

cut off Belshazzar's head, and brought it to Cyrus and Darius, who besieged Babylon. But Herodotus, who describes the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, says nothing of the death of Belshazzar, and Xenophon agrees with the Bible in stating that he was slain by the Persians in his palace, with all his attendants. "Babylon," says Professor Jahn, "was considered impregnable. Its high and strong walls, surmounted by lofty towers, its broad and deep ditches, its large magazines, and the numerous squares within the city, which were planted with corn, and yielded an annual supply of provisions, seemed sufficient to secure its inhabitants for ever from all the attacks of their enemies. The Chaldeans had reason to hope that the besiegers would finally relinquish their enterprise in despair. They were accordingly in high spirits, and derided the Persians from their walls and towers. Cyrus, however, continued for some time the siege of the city, and employed each month a twelfth part of his army in the service. But every effort was vain. A stratagem finally brought the city into the power of Cyrus. Having heard that it was customary at an approaching festival for the Babylonians to spend the whole night in banqueting and revelry, he employed a part of his army at some distance from the city to turn the course of the Euphrates into a large lake, according to Herodotus, but as Xenophon relates it, into an extensive ditch which he had sunk, as if for the purpose of rendering the blockade more complete, and by this means the water in the natural channel was so diminished that it could be easily forded. Meanwhile the siege was to all appearance carried on with the greatest vigour, that the Babylonians might not suspect his designs. When the appointed festival arrived, as soon as it was dark Cyrus placed one half of his army at the entrance of the Euphrates into the city, and the other half at its outlet. These two divisions entering the channel at the same time from above and below, pressed into the city through the gates leading down

to the river, which, in the negligence and dissipation of the feast, had not been closed, and imitating the shouts of the revelers, they assembled by preconcerted appointment round the royal palace. When the king, imagining that he heard the clamour of a drunken mob before the palace, ordered his guards to open the gates, in order to ascertain the cause of the disturbance, his foes rushed in with resistless force, overthrew every thing which opposed them, and penetrated to the royal apartment. Belshazzar indeed drew his sword, but he was immediately overpowered and slain, with all his attendants. All who were seen in the streets were put to the sword, and the Persians burnt those houses from the roofs of which they were annoyed, by setting fire to the bitumen." Thus fell Belshazzar in the midst of his impious revelry, and the mighty Babylonian empire was for ever annihilated.

The history of Belshazzar has been a favourite subject for poets and artists. Among the latter, the painting of the Feast by Martin is well known.

BELTESHAZZAR, or more properly **BELTSHAZZAR**, was the Assyrio-Babylonian name given to Daniel at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. The name indicates the esteem in which the idol Bel was held, and means the *prince of Bel*, or the *prince whom Bel favours*.

BENAIAH, the name of several persons mentioned in the Old Testament, particularly of a distinguished warrior in the reigns of David and Solomon, who was the rival and the successor of Joab in the command of the Hebrew army. He is noticed as one of three of David's "mighty men of valour," and we are told that "he slew two lion-like men of Moab; he went down also and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow, and he slew an Egyptian, a goodly man, and the Egyptian had a spear in his hand, but he went down to him with a staff, and plucked the spear out of the Egyptian's hand, and slew him with his own spear." Respecting the lion which Benaiah killed, Bochart conjectures that he entered into

a cave for shelter from a snow storm, and was there assailed by the savage animal in its own haunt. This supposition is strengthened from the fact that the exploit would have been otherwise less remarkable, as a lion, when confined in a narrow pit, cannot exercise the great power with which he is endued, and if he had fallen into or had been ensnared in a pit, there was no necessity of going down to kill him. This is one of several intimations in the Scriptures that to kill a lion, or any wild beast of prey, was reckoned an act of great bravery in ancient times.

BENHADAD, or the *son of Hadad*, is the name of several ancient kings of Syria who resided at Damascus. Benhadad I. was the son of Tabrimon, and began his reign about B.C. 940. Asa, king of Judah, induced him by costly presents to assist him against Baasha, king of Israel, when he was compelled to return to the defence of his own territories, and abandon Ramah, which he had undertaken to fortify, 1 Kings xv. 18.

BENHADAD II. was the son of the preceding, and is stated to have succeeded his father about B.C. 901. He continually harassed the kingdom of Israel during the reigns of Ahab, Abaziah, and Jehoram. In his war against Ahab he was totally defeated, and in the following year, when he renewed his attack upon the Israelites, he lost a great part of his army, and was compelled to submit to the mercy of Ahab, who treated him kindly, and allowed him to return peaceably to Damascus. In a new war undertaken by Ahab, assisted by Jehoshaphat, for the recovery of Ramoth-Gilead, the possession of which had been long retained by Benhadad, a battle ensued in which the Israelites were defeated, and Ahab was mortally wounded. The king of Syria afterwards besieged Samaria, and attempted to reduce it, but he failed, and became dangerously ill. He sent Hazael his minister to consult the Prophet Elisha concerning the result of his indisposition. Elisha told Hazael that

he would be the successor of his master—a prediction which was accomplished shortly after his return from the interview with the Prophet. “When Hazael was come to Benhadad,” says Josephus, “he told him good news concerning his distemper, but the next day he spread a wet cloth in the form of a net over him, and strangled him, and took his dominion. He was an active man, and enjoyed the good opinion of the Syrians and the people of Damascus to such a degree, that to this day both Benhadad and his successor Hazael are worshipped as gods on account of their munificence in erecting temples, which contributed greatly to adorn the city of Damascus.”

BEN-HADAD III. was the son and successor of Hazael in the kingdom of Syria. He was several times defeated by Joash, king of Israel, and was at length deprived of all his father's conquests.

BENJAMIN, the youngest son of Jacob by Rachel, who also named him Benoni, was one of the heads of the Twelve Tribes. He was the object of his father's peculiar affection, particularly after the disappearance of Joseph, his only brother by the same mother. Jacob reluctantly permitted him to accompany his other sons to Egypt when his return with them was made by Joseph the condition of their receiving a supply of corn. Joseph treated him with the greatest kindness, and contrived a pretext to detain him in Egypt, but afterwards, when he disclosed himself, he permitted him to return to his aged father. Nothing farther is known of his personal history.

BERNICE, or **BERENICE**, a Jewish princess, was the daughter of Agrippa I. and a sister of Agrippa II. She was born about A.D. 28, and at the age of sixteen married her uncle Herod, king of Chalcis. After his death, which happened in A.D. 48, her conduct was extremely licentious, and she was suspected of having criminal intercourse with her brother Agrippa. She endeavoured to silence these rumours by marrying Polemon, king of Pontus and part of Cilicia, on the condition of his embracing Judaism, but she lived with

him a very short time, and returned to her brother, when the former report was revived. Juvenal in his Sixth Satire refers to her shameful conduct.

Bernice was present with Agrippa at Cæsarea when he heard the discourse of St Paul before Festus. After the commencement of the Jewish War, when Agrippa was compelled to leave Jerusalem, she remained some time in that city, and attempted to intercede for the Jews with Florus, by whom she was treated with great disrespect. As Agrippa always remained faithful to the interest of the Romans, she accompanied him to the army of Vespasian, and she was enabled by costly presents to obtain the favour of that Emperor as long as he lived. She also captivated his son Titus, and followed him to Rome at the death of Vespasian. Titus was so much attached to her that he at one time was disposed to marry her, but in deference to the sentiments of the Romans, who disliked the idea of a foreign empress, and who well knew that her conduct was any thing but irreproachable, he sent her away to Judea, and what became of her afterwards is nowhere stated.

BERODACH-BALADAN, the son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sent ambassadors to King Hezekiah with letters and presents to congratulate him on his recovery from his sickness. The king, pleased with this mark of friendship, showed the ambassadors the riches and splendour of his palace. Isaiah was commissioned to inform him that this imprudence would afterwards be fatal, and that every thing which he had exhibited to these foreigners would be carried to Babylon.

BETHUEL, the daughter of Milcah and Nahor, and the mother of Rebekah, Gen. xxii. 22, 23.

BEZALEEL, of the tribe of Judah, and **AHOLIAB**, of the tribe of Dan, two skilful artificers, were chosen by Divine command to prepare the work of the tabernacle in the Wilderness—“to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of

stones, to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship." Here, and in other passages, we find mentioned together the metals which were procured, the earliest and first applied to useful and ornamental purposes. No other metals were employed in the construction of the tabernacle, and all others are simply noticed as if they were known, but not in common use. The three metals of gold, silver, and copper, were the first appropriated by mankind to their use, and we find them abundant in Egypt and Palestine a few centuries after the Flood. Nothing is known of Bezaleel and his colleague beyond the works in which they were engaged, and minutely described by Moses in the Book of Exodus.

BOAZ, a kinsman of Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, who is described as "a mighty man of wealth." The Jews maintain that the transactions recorded in the Book of Ruth occurred in the time of Ibzan, Judge of Israel, who succeeded Jephthah, and they farther conclude that Boaz was Ibzan himself, for which there appears to be no other authority than the circumstance that they were both natives of Bethlehem, and a desire to make the ancestor of David a person of as great distinction as possible. According to the Law of Moses, the poor were liberally treated in Canaan at the seasons of harvest and ingathering. The corners of the field were not to be reaped, the owner was not to glean his own field, and if a sheaf was accidentally left in the field, it was not to be taken away, but left for the poor. It appears from the narrative in the Book of Ruth, that the privilege of gleaning after the reapers, while they were still at work, was sometimes conceded as a matter of favour, granted to particular persons whom the owner wished to befriend. Ruth proposed to her mother-in-law Naomi to glean in the fields after the reapers, and it happened that she proceeded to "a part of the field belonging unto Boaz," namely, that part of the large extent of ground under cultivation

which was the property of the "mighty man of wealth," the arable land not being enclosed and subdivided in the East as in our country. When Boaz came from Bethlehem, after an interchange of devout salutation between himself and his labourers, his attention was arrested by the appearance of Ruth. He asked his principal servant, who had the charge of the reapers, who she was, and was answered, "She is the Moabitish damsel that came back with Naomi from the country of Moab." He was farther told that she had requested permission to glean after the reapers, and that she had continued almost the whole day. Boaz immediately addressed her in the kindest language, advised her to glean in no other field, but to abide "fast by his maidens," and to partake of their fare when she required refreshment, assuring her that he had given orders to his young men to treat her with respect and attention. The grateful Ruth bowed herself to the ground, after the custom of the country, to express her thanks for such generosity towards one who was a stranger to him, and not even a native of the country; but Boaz assured her that he knew who she was, and all she had done for her mother-in-law since the death of her husband—how she had "left her father and her mother, and the land of her nativity, and had come among a people whom she knew not heretofore"—"the Lord," he added, "recompense thy work, and a full reward be given thee of the God of Israel, under whose wings thou art come to trust." Ruth partook of the refreshments of the reapers, and proceeded to glean during the remainder of the day, Boaz having instructed his people to "let fall some of the handfuls of purpose for her, and leave them that she may glean them, and rebuke her not." In the evening she returned to her mother-in-law, and informed her of all the incidents of the day—of the kindness of Boaz, and that he had requested her to remain in his field among his reapers until the end of his harvest. Naomi expressed her joy at the result,

and recommended Ruth to comply with the request of Boaz, adding, "The man is near of kin to us, one of our own kinsmen."

The subsequent transactions in the beautiful pastoral narrative of Ruth are more fully considered in the account of the fair and devoted Moabitess, who adhered to Naomi in opposition to every obstacle, notwithstanding all the difficulties and privations to which the widowed pair were exposed. What is recorded in the third chapter affords some striking illustrations of the simplicity of rural manners, of which the whole Book affords an interesting picture. When Ruth, by desiring Boaz to spread his skirt or mantle over her, by which she declared herself entitled to that protection which a wife receives from her husband, or, in other words, desires him to make her his wife, as such Boaz understood it, and he thus addressed her—"Blessed be thou of the Lord, my daughter, for thou hast showed more kindness in the latter end than at the beginning, inasmuch as thou followedst not young men, whether poor or rich. And now, my daughter, fear not; I will do to thee all that thou requirest, for all the city of my people doth know that thou art a virtuous woman. And now, it is true that I am thy near kinsman; howbeit there is a kinsman nearer than I. Tarry this night, and it shall be in the morning, that if he will perform unto thee the part of a kinsman, well, let him do the kinsman's part; but if he will not do the part of a kinsman to thee, then I will do the part of a kinsman to thee, as the Lord liveth; lie down until the morning." She accordingly lay at his feet until the morning, when she quickly rose, and returned to her mother-in-law, by whose instructions she had all along acted. Boaz probably slept upon a rug or sheepskin, and was covered either by another, or by his mantle; and Ruth laid herself crossways at his feet, lifting up and drawing over her the extremity of the covering. Travellers inform us that even at the present time servants in the East

often sleep in this manner as to position, and in the same tent or apartment with their master, and when they do so they invariably lie at his feet in the manner described.

It is evident from the speech of Boaz to Ruth that he was considerably older than the fair Moabitess, who by this act declared herself subject to his direction and control. Ruth rose up very early in the morning, "before one could know another," for Boaz had said, "Let it not be known that a woman came into the floor," which intimates from this anxiety that the whole procedure would not have been considered correct in ordinary cases. When the morning advanced he went to the gate or public place of the city, where the very kinsman whom he mentioned to Ruth happened to pass. To understand properly the references in this part of the history, it is necessary to recollect that the Law required that, if a brother died without children, his next surviving brother, or, if he had no brother, his nearest relative, was bound to marry the widow, to raise up children to the deceased—his first born son by this widow was to be considered the son of the deceased, his name as such was to be inscribed in the genealogical records, and he was to receive the estate which necessarily devolved to him in that character. This principle existed long before Moses, when the surviving brother or nearest kinsman was compelled to marry the widow, but the Jewish lawgiver subjected it to certain limitations and directions, which restricted the choice on the part of the individual if he disliked the woman, or if the circumstance of his being already married made him averse to take another wife. In whatsoever way he might be situated, if he could not overcome his reluctance the Mosaic Law provided an alternative which, though easy in itself, was attended with certain marks of ignominy. The woman was publicly to take off his shoe, spit either in his face or on the ground before his face, and say, "So shall it be done unto that man who will not build up his brother's house." It

is also probable that his refusal was recorded in the genealogical registers in connection with his name. Under other circumstances, however, if the deceased brother or kinsman had left children of his own, the marriage with a brother's widow was strictly forbidden.

When Boaz perceived the kinsman who was a nearer relative than himself, he requested him to "turn aside, and he sat down," and he then summoned ten of the elders of Bethlehem, to whom he opened the business. He addressed the nearer kinsman in their presence—"Naomi, that is come again out of the country of Moab, selleth a parcel of land which was our brother Elimelech's; and I thought to advertise thee, saying, Buy it before the inhabitants, and before the elders of my people. If thou wilt redeem it, redeem it; but if thou wilt not redeem it, then tell me that I may know, for there is none to redeem it beside thee, and I am after thee." Thus far the kinsman offered no objection. He said, that he would redeem the "parcel of land," but when Boaz informed him that he must buy the land from Ruth as well as from Naomi—Ruth being the "wife of the dead, to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance," he declared that he could not redeem it for himself, otherwise he would injure his own inheritance, and he advised Boaz to take his right, thus relinquishing all claim to either the land or to Ruth. We are here told by the inspired writer—"Now this was the manner in former time in Israel concerning redeeming and changing, for to confirm all things: a man plucked off his shoe, and gave it to his neighbour, and this was a testimony in Israel." In the Book of Deuteronomy this act is directed to be performed by the woman, but here it was done by the man, who gave his shoe to Boaz. In the one instance it is probable that if the man refused to perform his duty without making an arrangement with his next relative to act for him, his shoe was taken from him with some ignominy, but in the present case, as the matter is

treated as an amicable transfer of right—Boaz having intimated that he would fulfil the Law, which he was indeed obliged to do, now that the nearer kinsman had relinquished his right—he was saved any humiliating treatment which might have followed his refusal. Boaz then appealed to the elders and persons assembled as witnesses of the transaction, that he had, in conformity to the Law, purchased the right of the nearer relative who stood between the widow of the deceased Mahlon, the son of Naomi, and himself, to any claim upon Ruth, and that he now took her to be his wife; and the persons present declared that they were witnesses, adding their devout wishes for the happiness and prosperity of Boaz and Ruth. The offspring of this marriage was Obed, the father of Jesse, and the grandfather of King David. Nothing more is known of his history which is authentic. Boaz thus became one of the human ancestors of our blessed Saviour, in whose person, as the long-promised Messiah, terminated the lineal descendants of that distinguished Hebrew monarch. Thus are the wonderful arrangements of Jehovah accomplished! Naomi, widowed and helpless in her old age, returned to the country of her ancestors, accompanied by her daughter-in-law Ruth, a stranger, also widowed and helpless. But the noble devotion and attachment she evinced in her determination to follow Naomi, notwithstanding all her expostulations, were dictated by that unerring wisdom which is "wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working;" and there was something prophetic in her declaration to the aged widow of Elimelech—"Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee, for whither thou goest, I will go, and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God. Where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried; the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part me and thee." The origin of the family of David, which appears to be the principal design of the Book of

Ruth, and consequently of the family of the Messiah, is a circumstance sufficient to render the interviews of Boaz with Ruth, her gleanings in his fields, his kind instructions to his domestics concerning her, and his marriage, of inestimable value and esteem, because it "delivers down to us," says Pyle, "the original of Christ

according to the flesh, whose derivation was not only from such a particular tribe of Israel, in confirmation of the indubitable promises concerning him, but partly also from a virtuous Gentile woman, denoting that all nations were to share in Him, and have just hopes of his mercy."

C

CAIAPHAS, called also JOSEPH, who was the high priest of the Jews at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, was appointed by Valerius Gratus. He was the son-in-law of the former high priest Annas, or Ananus, and succeeded Simon the son of Camithus, A.D. 26. He held the office till A.D. 38, when he was removed by Vitellius, and succeeded by Jonathan, a son of Annas. Caiaphas was high priest all the time Pontius Pilate was in Judea.

CAIN, the eldest son of Adam and Eve, and the first-born of the human race, devoted himself to husbandry, while his brother Abel followed the occupation of a shepherd. The fatal effects of the fall of our progenitors were soon exemplified in Cain; Jehovah preferred the sacrifices of Abel, and Cain, without in any degree respecting the remonstrance which the Almighty was pleased to address to him, murdered his brother. A severe sentence was pronounced against him; he was condemned to a wandering and exiled state of life, which made him apprehensive that any one in future years who found him would kill him. But God was pleased to calm his fears by setting a peculiar mark upon him, which would be recognized, and preserve him. Thus, even the dreadful crime of which Cain was guilty, was in some measure made to accelerate the mysterious purposes of Providence. Cain was the first who separated from his father's society, and he was impelled to this step through fear of punishment for the murder of his brother. In the course of time various motives,

such as a desire to obtain land for cultivation, and pasturage for cattle, would induce others, and especially his own descendants, to follow his example.

Cain retired to the country called Nod, eastward of Eden, and built a city to which he gave the name of his son Enoch. This is all that is said of him in the inspired record, except where his name is mentioned in an admonitory manner. But Josephus chooses to inform us that Cain, instead of becoming reformed by his punishment, became more wicked and violent, and his immediate descendants became bands of thieves, headed by himself. He is accused of corrupting the simplicity and honesty of the world, and is said to have invented weights and measures. It is also said that he was the first who built and fortified a city, and set bounds to fields. Certain it is, as the inspired historian himself intimates, his sons were the inventors of several useful arts. The descendants of this wretched fratricide are specially noticed by Moses during the ten generations he records, as proceeding to a fearful state of profligacy and impiety, and as committing those lawless deeds of violence which prove too clearly that the power of the strong passed for the right. "Those famous heroes of great stature," says Jahn, "the giants of the old world, who are mentioned as the authors of these crimes, were either powerful chiefs, who engaged in open wars, or perhaps merely wandering robbers, who with their lawless bands everywhere plundered and murdered the

defenceless. The prevailing form of government during this period was probably the Patriarchal, though the Patriarchs were either unable to restrain and bring to punishment strong-handed transgressors, or, swayed by the ties of relationship, and in many cases by a participation in the spoil, they were unwilling to exert their authority for this purpose." The latter observations, however, are too favourably expressed. We are positively told that the depravities and impieties of which the descendants of Cain were guilty, and of which we can form no adequate conception, were wilfully committed. The wickedness of men became great; in an evil hour they corrupted the descendants of Seth, and, with the exception of the direct line of that family, a total apostacy and depravity ensued. Jehovah armed himself with vengeance, and swept off from the face of the earth a race who had polluted it by their crimes. The murder of Abel was thus visited on the whole of Cain's posterity; that of Seth, who had become connected with them by intermarriage, shared the same fate, and there is not a human being in the world who is descended from the first shedder of blood.

As is the case with the other Antediluvian Patriarchs, there is abundance of conjectures, imaginary fancies, and foolish traditions, related of Cain. The spot where he killed his brother, and his tomb, are pretended to be shown in the neighbourhood of Damascus. Numerous are the suppositions respecting the mark or sign of preservation from those whom his guilty conscience told him might revenge the murder of his brother which God gave to Cain. It is variously conjectured that God imprinted a letter, either taken from the ineffable name of the Deity, or from the name Abel, on Cain's forehead—that the mark consisted in three letters, which compose the word Sabbath, or in the sign of the cross—that the leprosy covered his face—that the mark consisted of a wild aspect of countenance, with bloody eyes, which rolled in a horrid manner—that he became subject

to such a trembling of body, that he could scarcely get meat and drink to his mouth—that wherever he stopped the ground quaked around him—and there are some who allege that a literal horn grew out of his forehead to warn men not to come near him. There are also some who assert that the dog which guarded Abel's flocks was given to Cain as a constant companion, either that every one might know, by the presence of the animal, not to attack him, or to prevent him from taking any dangerous road. It is pretended that he lived nearly eight hundred years, and that he was buried under the ruins of a house; and it is argued that he slew himself. A Continental writer foolishly asserts that he perished in the Deluge, which would make him nearly two thousand years old. We may well be astonished at these fancies, and yet they are not the reveries of ignorant enthusiasts, but the sober statements of men of learning. An Oriental tradition of Cain's death is to the following effect:—Being feeble and blind, he one day sat down to rest among some very thick bushes. Lamech, who was then hunting, hearing a noise in the thicket at a little distance, and imagining that a wild beast was lurking in it, discharged an arrow and killed Cain. The inventors of such fancies and traditions forget that Cain's mark was given him as a protection and safeguard—that, guilty as he was, he had a part to fulfil in the arrangements of Divine Providence—and that the promise of Jehovah was so expressed as to regard those only whom Cain had most reason to dread in his banishment—probably the other descendants of Adam who might occasionally come in contact with him in his exile. When Jehovah pronounced that he would be a "fugitive and a wanderer" on the earth—namely, that he would have no rest in any country, but wander up and down, unquietly, not knowing where to settle, the severity of the sentence startled even the guilty fratricide. He said, "My punishment is greater than I can bear;" or, as it is in the marginal reading, "My iniquity is

greater than that I can be forgiven. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth," meaning that he was banished from the country of his birth in which he then was—"and from thy face shall I be hid," or banished from the glorious majesty of the Almighty, and by the same progress of guilt he adds despair to his former sins—for he does not attempt to supplicate God for mercy—and terror, lest he should find no mercy from man. "In the persons of these two brothers," says Bishop Horne, "whose history is recorded as an example for our admonition, are characterized the two opposite spirits that have ever since divided the world between them, and will continue to do so till the consummation of all things; that is to say, the humble, obedient, and suffering spirit of faith, and the haughty, rebellious, and persecuting spirit of infidelity. He who would be remembered with the children of God must copy the example of Abel—he who chooses to have his portion with the seed of the evil one may go in the way of Cain." To this it may be added, that the murder of Abel by Cain was an awful lesson of reproof and instruction to Adam. It showed him the consequences of the Fall, by exhibiting death in its most appalling and frightful aspect—the first death, too, which occurred in the world.

CAINAN, one of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, the son of Enos, was born A.M. 325.

CALEB, the son of Jephunneh, of the tribe of Judah, was one of the spies deputed by Moses to explore the Promised Land. He and Joshua returned with a favourable report, and revived the dejected Hebrews by their assurances of success in the projected conquest of the country. The faith which they exemplified on this occasion was rewarded by the prediction of Moses, that they were to be the only two persons of all the people who came out of Egypt who would enter the country of Canaan. After the Israelites, under the command of Joshua, had conquered their long promised in-

heritance, Caleb obtained for his portion the city and mountainous district of Kirjath-Arba, or Hebron, then possessed by the three sons of Anak. Finding it extremely difficult to expel them from the town of Debir, he promised his daughter Achsah in marriage to any one who would take it. This was effected by his nephew Othniel. Caleb then settled at Hebron, and is said to have lived to his hundred and fourteenth year.

CALLISTHENES, an officer of the king of Syria, who set fire to the gates of the Temple. He was put to death at the festival celebrated at Jerusalem for the victories obtained over the generals of Antiochus by Judas Maccabæus, 2 Macc. viii. 33.

CANAAN was the fourth or youngest son of Ham, according to the order in which his name is introduced, Gen. x. 6. The time of his birth and the duration of his life are not known, but some have supposed that he was born in the Ark, and it has been fancifully argued that he was a wicked man, because he was the offspring of an unreasonable incontinence. The irreverent conduct of Ham was retaliated on Canaan by Noah, who, in the spirit of prophecy, pronounced a malediction on this branch of his posterity—"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." As Ham was the immediate aggressor, and as Moses does not intimate that Canaan had personally any connection with the crime, many conjectures have been offered to solve this difficulty of the inspired historian. Some commentators imagine that Canaan joined with his father Ham in the mocking of and insult to Noah; and the Rabbins have a tradition that Canaan was the first who discovered Noah in the peculiar position noticed by Moses, and he called his father, with whom he concurred in his act of irreverence. Others contend that this curse was so far from being pronounced upon Canaan for Ham's transgression, that it was not pronounced for his own, nor was it executed several hundred years after his death; and, in reality, it is

properly to be understood as referring not to himself as an individual, but to his descendants the Canaanites. Canaan is supposed to have lived and died in the country called after his own name. His posterity was numerous, and his eldest son Sidon, who founded the city of that name, was the father of the Sidonians and Phœnicians. His ten other sons were the ancestors of as many tribes in Palestine and Syria—the Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites, Girgasites, Hivites, Arkites, Sinites, Arvadites, Zemarites, and Hamathites. Canaan was known to the ancient pagan writers. Sanchoniatho occasionally mentions *Cna*, the first Phœnician; and Bryant inclines to the supposition that Canaan was known as *Cnaan* by the Egyptians and neighbouring nations.

CANDACE, the common name of the queens of the African Ethiopia lying below Egypt in the south part of Africa. One of the principal officers of the queen who reigned in the Apostolic times was converted and baptized by Philip, and he is said to have introduced Christianity into Abyssinia, as the son of the queen of Sheba by Solomon is said to have established Judaism in that country. The Abyssinian tradition is entitled to some attention, for we certainly find that this Ethiopian nobleman was a Jew, and “had come to Jerusalem for to worship, and was returning, and sitting in his chariot, reading Esaias the Prophet,” when he was met by Philip.

CENDEBEUS, a general of the army of Antiochus Sidetes. That prince, having quarrelled with Simon, high priest and prince of the Jews, seized the government of the coast along the Mediterranean, and gave it to Cendebeus, with orders to lay waste Judea. He was effectually opposed by the Maccabees, 1 Macc. xv. 38.

CEPHAS, a name which means a *stone*, applied by our Saviour to St Peter, who is supposed, though it is doubted, to be the same Cephas whom St Paul says he “withstood to the face” at Antioch. The best authorities among the ancient

Fathers consider this Cephas to designate St Peter.

CESAR, or CÆSAR, the well known imperial title of the Roman Emperors till the destruction of the Empire, and since applied to several imperial sovereigns in Europe. It was the surname of Julius Cæsar, and it was decreed by the Senate that all succeeding Emperors should bear it. At the death of his nephew Augustus, the appellation of Augustus was appropriated to the Emperors out of compliment to that great man, and the title of Cæsar was given to the second person in the Empire, though it also continued to be given to the first. It is always used in reference to the Emperor himself by the New Testament writers. The Imperial Cæsars mentioned by them are Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero.

CHÆREAS, brother of Timotheus and Apollophanes, was governor of Gazara. He and his brothers were killed in a marsh, where they had attempted to conceal themselves after the capture of that place, 2 Macc. x. 32, 37.

CHEDORLAOMER, one of the five petty kings who confederated against the Pentapolis of Sodom. See ABRAHAM.

CLAUDIA, a Roman lady converted by St Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 21. Some conjecture that she was the wife of Pudens, who is mentioned immediately before her; and Martial speaks of Claudia, the wife of Pudens. Others suppose her to have been a British lady, the wife of Aulus Rufus Pudens.

CLAUDIUS, one of the Imperial Cæsars, succeeded Caligula in A.D. 41, and reigned thirteen years, when he was poisoned by his wife Agrippina, the mother of Agrippa. In his time happened the famine predicted by Agabus.

CLAUDIUS LYSIAS, a tribune of the Roman troops stationed in the tower Antonia near the Temple of Jerusalem. When he observed the tumult raised by the Jews against St Paul, whom they had seized and intended to murder, he rescued him, and carried him into the fort, whence he sent him under a guard to Cæsarea.

CLAUDIUS FELIX. See FELIX.

CLEMENT. a zealous coadjutor of St Paul, whom that great Apostle mentions among those in the Epistle to the Philippians who had "laboured with him in the Gospel, and whose names were in the book of life." Clement is the third in the succession of the Bishops of Rome; and, if we are to place any reliance on the general admission of ecclesiastical antiquity, he is the distinguished person noticed by the Apostle as one of his chosen friends, fellow-labourers, and co-adjutors. Mr Bower cites all the passages of the Christian Fathers respecting the identity of Clement. Origen, Eusebius, and the other writers of the primitive times, acknowledge him as such. St Chrysostom concludes that, together with St Luke and Timothy, he attended St Paul in all his journeys. Irenæus says that he had seen the Apostles and conversed with them, and that when he was appointed Bishop of Rome he "still heard their voices sounding in his ears—still had before his eyes the rules and good example they had given." Origen styles him *the disciple of the Apostles*; Ruffinus says that he was *almost an Apostle*; and Clement of Alexandria declares that he was *an Apostle*.

Of the early history of Clement nothing is known. Some ancient writers have asserted that he was born at Rome, and allied to the Imperial Cæsars, and in his Epistle, subsequently noticed, it has been said that he intimates a Jewish origin, simply because he calls Jacob *our father*; but it is appropriately observed by Jahn that such an expression is not unusual even among those who had been converted from Paganism to Christianity, nothing being more common than for Christians to speak as if they were Abraham's children—as if the Law, the Patriarchs, and the Prophets, belonged to them as well as to the Jews. On the death of Cletus he was unanimously chosen by the presbyters of Rome to be their bishop, which gave great satisfaction to the Christian congregations. He lived during the reigns of Domitian,

Nerva, and Trajan, and died, according to Eusebius, in the third year of the reign of the last named Emperor, in A.D. 100. The most remarkable event which happened during the time he exercised pastoral superintendence over the Roman Christians was the persecution of Domitian, but no author gives us any information as to the part he was called to sustain in it. He has a place among the martyrs in the Canon of the Mass, which is no authority whatever. Various miracles are imputed to him, all of them, it is unnecessary to add, entirely fabulous. It is said, for instance, that when he was banished by Trajan beyond the Euxine Sea, for which alleged fact there is no evidence, he "caused a fountain to spring up for the relief of the Christians confined to the same inhospitable region—that he converted the whole population of that country, which so much provoked the Emperor, that he ordered him to be thrown into the sea with an anchor fastened to his neck—and that upon the anniversary of his death the sea retired to the place where he had been drowned, though three miles from the shore, when there invariably appeared a magnificent temple, all of the finest marble, and in the temple a stately monument, in which was found the body of the saint."

Various writings are ascribed to Clement, but these are all spurious with the exception of his Epistle to the Corinthians, which has long been admitted to be genuine. It was anciently held in such estimation, that it was ranked by some among the canonical books, and by all revered next to them. It was written in the name of the whole Church at Rome, and it is hence called the *Epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians* by Eusebius and Irenæus. "It was," says our author, "composed by Clement in the name of the Church, for in the primitive times bishops did nothing by themselves, but every thing jointly with their churches—we exhort, we recommend—was their usual style, which the Popes still observe though they mean only themselves, for they scorn to join either with the clergy

or the people. The style of this excellent letter is plain, clear, full of energy, without any useless ornaments, and the whole is written with the simplicity which, as Photius observes, the Church requires in Ecclesiastical writers. There is so great an affinity, both as to the sense and the words, between this Epistle and the Epistle to the Hebrews, that some have concluded Clement to have been the translator, nay, and the author of the latter. In Clement's Epistle Photius discovers, as he thinks, three faults—viz. that he supposes other worlds beyond the ocean—that he speaks of the phoenix as a real bird—and that he uses words expressing the humanity of our Saviour, and not his divinity. But as to the first of these objections there can be no difficulty now, when we know for certain what was doubtfully advanced by the ancients; in speaking of the phoenix he complies with the opinion universally received by the learned, both among Christians and Pagans; as to the third objection, Photius must not have observed that he styles our Saviour's sufferings the *sufferings of God*, which was acknowledging his divinity.—“This Epistle is the most precious and valuable treasure of which the Church can boast after the Holy Scriptures,” and that it “is genuine, appears from a great many passages quoted out of it by the ancients.”

The precise time at which this Epistle was written is not ascertained. Archbishop Wake concludes that it was written shortly after the end of the persecution under Nero, between A.D. 64 and A.D. 70; and, from several expressions which occur in it, there can be little doubt that it was composed after some persecution, either that now referred to, or that in the latter end of the reign of Domitian, A.D. 94, or A.D. 96. The chief design of it is to settle some dissensions which existed in the church at Corinth about their spiritual governors and pastors excited by a few turbulent persons; and Clement recommends not only concord and harmony, but charity, humility, all the virtues of a good life, and

several of the great articles and principles of religion. He mentions by name only the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which he says was written by St Paul; but his Epistle contains frequent allusions to the various books both of the Old and New Testaments. It is worthy of notice, too, that there are no quotations from, or references to, any of the Apocryphal writings, or spurious gospels, as they are called, “nor do I remember,” adds Dr Lardner, “that any of the passages of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, or that *according to the Egyptians*, which have been collected by learned men from the writings of the ancient Christians, are taken out of this Epistle.”

The passages which Photius notices as containing allusions to *worlds beyond the ocean*, and to the *phoenix*, are to the following effect, as translated by Archbishop Wake:—“The heavens, moving by God's appointment, are subject to Him in peace. Day and night accomplish the courses that he has allotted unto them, not disturbing one another. The sun and moon, and all the several companies and constellations of the stars, run the courses that he has appointed to them in concord, without departing in the least from them. The fruitful earth yields its food plentifully in due season both to man and beast, and to all animals that are upon it, according to His will, not disputing nor altering any thing that was ordained by Him. So, also, the unfathomable and unsearchable floods are kept in by his command, and the conflux of the vast sea, being brought together by his order into its several collections, passes not the bounds that He has set to it, but, as He appointed it, so it remains. For He said, ‘Hitherto shalt thou come, and thy floods shall be broken within thee.’ The ocean, impassable to mankind, *and the worlds that are beyond it*, are governed by the same commands of their great Master. Spring and summer, autumn and winter, give place peaceably to each other. The several quarters (stations) of the winds fulfil their work in their seasons without

offending one another. The ever-flowing fountains, made both for pleasure and health, never fail to reach out their breasts to support the life of man. Even the smallest creatures live (mix) together in peace and concord with each other. All these has the great Creator and Lord of all commanded to observe peace and concord, being good to all, but especially to us who flee to His mercy through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and majesty for ever and ever, Amen."

The venerable apostolical father introduces the *phœnix* in an argument on the great truth of the resurrection, from which it appears that in his time the very same heresy had been agitated in the Corinthian Church which had called forth the reproof and conclusive reasoning of St Paul. It will be observed, that he speaks of the *phœnix* according to the common belief of his age:—"Let us consider, Beloved, how the Lord does continually show us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has made our Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits, raising him from the dead. Let us contemplate, Beloved, the resurrection that is continually made before our eyes. Day and night manifest a resurrection to us. The night lies down, and the day arises: again the day departs, and the night comes on. Let us behold the fruits of the earth. Every one sees how the seed is sown. The sower goes forth, and casts it upon the earth, and the seed, which, when it was sown, fell upon the earth dry and naked, in time dissolves, and from the dissolution the great power of the providence of the Lord raises it again, and of one seed many arise and bring forth fruit. Let us consider that wonderful type of the resurrection, which is seen in the Eastern countries, namely, in Arabia. There is a certain bird called a *phœnix*. Of this there is never but one at a time, and that lives five hundred years. And when the time of its dissolution draws near that it must die, it makes itself a nest of frankincense and myrrh, and other spices, into which,

when its time is fulfilled, it enters and dies. But its flesh putrifying breeds a certain worm, which, being nourished with the juice of the dead bird, brings forth feathers, and when it is grown to a perfect state it takes up the nest, in which the bones of its parent lie, and carries it from Arabia into Egypt, to a city called Heliopolis, and, flying in open day in the sight of all men, lays it upon the altar of the sun, and returns whence it came. The priests then search into the records of the time, and find that it returned precisely at the end of five hundred years."

"The Apostles," he says in another place, and more appropriately, "have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ—Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God, the Apostles by Christ, so both were orderly sent, according to the will of God. For, having received their command, and being thoroughly assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and convinced by the word of God, with the fulness of the Holy Spirit, they went abroad publishing that the kingdom of God was at hand. And thus preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be bishops and ministers over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit. Nor was this any thing new, seeing that long before it was written concerning bishops and deacons, for thus saith the Scriptures in a certain place, 'I will appoint their overseers in righteousness, and their ministers in faith.'

"The messengers whom we have sent unto you, Claudius Ephebus, and Valerius Bito, with Fortunatus, send back to us again with all speed in peace and with joy, that they may the sooner acquaint us with your peace and concord, so much prayed for and desired by us, and that we may rejoice in your good order."

There is only one MS. of this Epistle remaining, and it is not entire, some parts of it being lost. Archbishop Wake gives the following account of the "man-

ner of its discovery and publication."— "It happened about the beginning of the last age [the seventeenth century] that Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, having removed thence to Constantinople, brought along with him a great treasure of books to that city. Amongst the rest he had a very ancient manuscript copy both of the Septuagint Old and of the Greek New Testament, written about four hundred years after Christ. This he sent, as the most valuable present he was master of, to our late royal sovereign King Charles the First, by Sir Thomas Roe, his Majesty's ambassador at that time at the Porte. Being thus brought into England, and placed in the Royal Library at St James's, Mr Patrick Young [whom Bower, in his History of the Popes, designates *Patricius Junius*], the learned Keeper of the King's Library at that time, discovered this Epistle, with part of another, at the end of the New Testament, and was thereupon commanded by his Majesty to publish it for the benefit of the world. This he accordingly did, with a Latin translation and notes, at Oxford, anno 1633. It was not long after (1647) that a very learned man, and a great master of the Greek tongue, Mr William Burton, translated it into English, and published it very accurately, and with new annotations of his own. This I had not seen till the first sheets of the present edition were sent to the press; and though I believe whosoever shall take the pains to compare the two translations together will find them generally agreeing as to the sense, yet there will otherwise appear such manifest differences between them as will satisfy any impartial person that I have truly translated it from the original Greek, and not revised only Mr Burton's edition."

CLEOPAS, or CLEOPHAS, or CLOPAS, a name of Alphæus, the father of James the Less. Our Saviour met him and another disciple after his resurrection on their journey to Emmaus, and held the interesting conversation with them narrated by St Luke. Their eyes were at

first "holden that they did not know him," and as soon as he discovered himself he disappeared from them. They returned to Jerusalem, and communicated the joyful intelligence to the Apostles, thus adding their testimony to what had been already ascertained, that the "Lord was risen indeed, and had appeared to Simon." Cleopas is said to have been the father of Simeon, James the Less, Jude, and Joseph or Joses. His wife was a sister of the Blessed Virgin. It is said that he suffered martyrdom, and was buried in the same house where he had received our Saviour.

CLEOPATRA, the name of three princesses of Egypt. The first, the daughter of Antiochus the Great, and wife of Ptolemy Epiphanes, is supposed to be referred to by the Prophet Daniel (xi. 17). The second, the daughter of this marriage, is mentioned in the Apocryphal additions to the Book of Esther; and the third, the daughter of that Cleopatra and of Ptolemy Philometer, is noticed in the Maccabees. She was first married to Alexander Balas, king of Syria, and then to Antiochus, the brother of Demetrius Nicator.

CORNELIUS, a centurion of the "Italian band" or cohort, probably the body-guard of the Roman governor residing at Casarea, is distinguished in the Apostolic history as the first Gentile convert to the Church. He is described as "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house," which intimates that he was not an idolater, though by race and education a Gentile, but a worshipper of the true God; and he is farther noticed as one "who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway." The conversion of this amiable and eminent individual completely removed the Jewish prejudices from the mind of St Peter relative to the exclusiveness of the Gospel to the Jews, and compelled him to exclaim, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." The Apostle was subsequently

censured at Jerusalem for associating with "men uncircumcised," and "eating with them." When he narrated the whole circumstances connected with the baptism of Cornelius, and had finished his explanation, the Apostles "glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." This indicates that previous to this the whole of them thought that their mission was to be confined to Judea, and those Jews settled in Gentile countries.

CRESCENS, a coadjutor of St Paul, who, the Apostle informs us, preached the gospel in Galatia, or rather whom he had probably sent thither to exercise jurisdiction.

CRISPUS, the chief ruler of a synagogue at Corinth, converted and baptized by St Paul.

CYRENIUS, so called in St Luke's Gospel, a Roman governor of Syria, whose real name was Publius Sulpicius Quirinus. He was made prefect of the province when the Emperor Augustus united Judea and Samaria to Syria in A.D. 12. Cyrenius, otherwise Quirinus, confiscated the property of Archelaus, and took the census referred to by St Luke (ii. 1, 2) to apportion the tribute among the people, when "there went a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed," namely, that all persons in the Roman Empire, proudly called *the world*, should have their names and conditions of life registered according to their families. This measure of the Roman government excited great discontent among the Jews, which all the exertions of the then high priest Joazar could not allay. Judas the Gaulanite of Gamalis, or the Galilean (for Josephus gives him both of these designations), and one Sadduc, a Sadducee, represented this census of the people, the valuation of their property, and the payment of tribute, as the most shameful slavery, and contrary to the Mosaic Law, which, they alleged, acknowledged God as their only sovereign. By their misrepresentations of the Law in this particular they soon raised a party, and excited great commo-

tions. About the period noticed by the Evangelist they appear to have been suppressed, but their adherents mustered in considerable force, who subsequently contributed much to the disturbances of the nation, and to their last rebellion against the Romans. When Quirinus completed the census he removed the high priest Joazar, who had incurred the displeasure of the people, and promoted Ananus, called Annas by St Luke (iii. 2), to that dignity, who retained it till A.D. 23.

CYRUS, a celebrated and illustrious king of Persia, intimately connected with some important prophecies, and a chosen instrument of Jehovah to accomplish his purposes. He was the grandson of Astyages, who, in conjunction with Nabopolassar, the founder of the Chaldæo-Babylonian Empire, destroyed the city of Nineveh, and overthrew the Assyrian Empire. Under Cyaxares II., the son of Astyages, called Darius the Mede in the Scriptures, those hostilities broke out between the Median and Chaldean Empires which terminated only in the destruction of the latter. The siege of Babylon by Cyrus is the first point at which sacred history touches with the profane.

In the ancient Pehlivi dialect the name *Cyrus*, which in Hebrew signifies the *sun*, is *korshid*, a compound word signifying *splendour of the sun*, from *kor* and *shid*, signifying *light*, or the *sun*, and *splendour*. The name first occurs in the Prophecy of Isaiah (xliv. 28; xlv. 1), where he is introduced in this remarkable manner:—"Thus saith the Lord—that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid."—"Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy

name; I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." And in the Prophecy of Jeremiah (li. 11, 21-24) we have among the denunciations against Babylon the following intimations respecting Cyrus and the Median kings, though the latter is not mentioned by name—"Make bright the arrows; gather the shields; the Lord hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes; for his decree is against Babylon to destroy it, because it is the vengeance of the Lord, —*the vengeance of his Temple.*—Thou (Cyrus) art my battle axe and weapons of war, for with thee will I break in pieces nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms, and with thee will I break in pieces the horse and his rider, and with thee will I break in pieces the chariot and his rider; with thee also will I break in pieces man and woman; and with thee will I break in pieces old and young; and with thee will I break in pieces the young man and the maid; I will break in pieces with thee the shepherd and his flock; and with thee will I break in pieces the husbandman and his yoke of oxen; and with thee will I break in pieces captains and rulers." The prophecy of Isaiah was uttered according to the Hebrew chronology, B. C. 712, those of Jeremiah against Babylon, B. C. 595. Cyrus, it is generally admitted, was born about six hundred years before the Christian era. Before narrating any particulars of the life of this illustrious monarch of antiquity, it will be useful to analyze the prophecies concerning him, especially that of Isaiah, uttered more than one hundred years before he was born, in the reign of Hezekiah, king of Judah.

Cyrus is called by Jehovah, long before his birth, "my shepherd" and "my anointed," and all the circumstances connected with him have induced Dr Hales, after reviewing his character and history, to conclude that "he lived and died the death of the righteous," and that he was a believer in the true God as known to the Patriarchs, who had been worshipped by his venerable Pishdadian ancestors. He is specially noticed as "saying to

Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." The prophecy of Jeremiah is before the reader respecting him, and the summary *vengeance of the Temple* which he was to inflict on the idolatrous Babylonians, whose city he surprised at the very moment they were profaning, at their unhalloed revelry, the vessels of the house of God at Jerusalem, which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away. Now, in the Book of Ezra, which commences B. C. 536, we are told that in the first year of the reign of Cyrus, "that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, saying, Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he hath charged me to build an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah: Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem. And whoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, besides the freewill offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem."—"Also Cyrus the king brought forth the vessels of the house of the Lord, which Nebuchadnezzar had brought forth out of Jerusalem, and had put them in the house of his gods, even these did Cyrus, king of Persia, bring forth by the hand of Mithredath the treasurer, and numbered them unto Shethbazzar, the prince of Judah." All which Cyrus states in his proclamation unquestionably intimates his acquaintance with the prophecies of Isaiah concerning him, for he is no where else charged to build a house to the Lord at Jerusalem, and he distinctly acknowledges that the God who so charged him was the God of heaven, who had given him "all the kingdoms of the earth," or, as the Prophet expresses it, who had enabled

him "to subdue nations before him." This part of the prediction was amply verified, and is also expressly acknowledged by Cyrus. He had not only, as he well knew, subdued the greater part of his own subjects, but the nations over which he reigned were so numerous, and inhabiting such an extent of territory, that Xenophon describes them as extending from the Mediterranean and Egypt, the Indian Ocean, and from Ethiopia to the Euxine Sea, observing that the extremities of this vast range of imperial dominion were difficult to inhabit from opposite causes—some from excess of heat, and others from excess of cold—some from a scarcity of water, and others from too great an abundance of that element. We may safely conclude, therefore, that he was convinced in his own mind of his express appointment by Jehovah to achieve his great and successful undertakings, and that he was enabled to perceive the truth of the Divine declaration which is specially addressed to himself—"I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God beside me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known me." It must also be recollected that the Prophet Daniel, who was resident at his court, would in all probability direct his attention to these predictions, and explain those intimations concerning Jehovah which they so prominently contain, and on which they are authoritatively based. He was finally to receive "the treasures of darkness," or treasures hid in dark and secret places, as is commonly the case in Oriental countries. The wealth which Cyrus obtained by his numerous Asiatic victories has been calculated at no less than £126,234,000. But the conqueror of Cræsus, the richest monarch of his time, and of whose vast treasures he became master, neither hoarded parsimoniously the wealth he received, nor profusely squandered it in licentious prodigality. He liberally rewarded his followers, and freely distributed it among his friends.

Let us now attend to the personal history of this remarkable Oriental monarch of antiquity. In the Scriptures

Cyrus is noticed as the successor of Darius the Mede, who must either be Astyages, or his son Cyaxares II., according as we adopt the authority of Herodotus or Xenophon. He is farther introduced as the captor of Babylon, and as releasing the Jews from their captivity. The destruction of Babylon had been announced to Belshazzar by Daniel, and the prophet was afterwards minister both to Darius the Mede and to Cyrus. Besides releasing the Jews, Cyrus restored all the sacrilegious plunder which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away from the Temple of Jerusalem, and ordered that edifice to be rebuilt. This is the substance of what is said of him in the inspired writings, but "wherever his name is mentioned," observes the historian of Persia, "it is as a king who was alike eminent for wisdom and virtue, and who enjoyed great renown and extensive dominion upon earth."

We have three several accounts of Cyrus by Herodotus, Xenophon, and Ctesias. According to the first named authority Cyrus was the grandson of Astyages, the king of Media, whose daughter had married Cambyzes, a Persian nobleman. Astyages inferring from a dream that he was to be dethroned by one of his own race, resolved to prevent this misfortune by putting Cyrus to death, and consigned the child to his minister, named Harpagus, for that purpose. The minister employed a shepherd to kill the young Cyrus, but that individual, influenced by his wife, preserved him, and even educated him in a manner suitable to his birth. Some years afterwards Astyages discovered that his orders had been disobeyed, and, although he desisted from any further designs against the life of his grandson, he punished the neglect of Harpagus by putting to death his son. This induced the minister to cherish the most deadly resentment towards Astyages. He formed a conspiracy to dethrone him, and to elevate Cyrus, who becoming acquainted with his designs, excited the Persians to revolt, and marched against Ecbatana. Astyages, ignorant of the

conduct of his minister, entrusted him with the command of the army against Cyrus, and the moment that prince appeared Harpagus went over to the Persian camp, accompanied by most of the troops of Astyages. Ecбатана was consequently easily reduced, the Median Empire was overthrown, and Astyages afterwards resided in a private manner at the court of his grandson. Herodotus farther states that he had heard several accounts of the death of Cyrus, and that he was most inclined to believe that which stated him to have been slain in an expedition against the Massagetæ, whom he had previously overcome by making them intoxicated, and taking prisoner their commander, the son of their Queen Tomyris, who, after he was released, slew himself through shame. Tomyris collected her forces, engaged and defeated Cyrus, whose head she struck off, and cast into a vessel filled with human blood, exclaiming, "Survivor and conqueror as I am, thou hast ruined my peace by thy successful stratagem against my son, but I give thee now, as I threatened thee, thy fill of blood."

Xenophon next gives us his account. He tells us that Cyrus was the son of Cambyses, whom he designates a prince of the Persidæ, or race of Persus. His mother was Mandane, daughter of Astyages. Cyrus while yet a youth brought an army to the assistance of his uncle Cyaxares II. in a war with the king of Assyria; he married the daughter of his uncle, and was nominated by him his successor. Xenophon adds that Cyrus died at Babylon after seeing a vision warning him of his approaching end—a statement which the Greek writer is supposed to have purposely made, that he might introduce a philosophical discourse on death in the name of Cyrus.

Ctesias, who resided at the Persian court as a physician, but whose authority, nevertheless, is entitled to no great credit on that account, tells us that Cyrus was not the descendant of Astyages, whom he calls Aspadan, but had married his daughter Amytis after he had dethroned him.

He sent a eunuch to bring Aspadan to his court some time after he had deposed him, but the messenger permitted him to perish with hunger while traversing a forest. He farther informs us that Cyrus was killed in a war with an Indian nation by a javelin. Lucan, on the other hand, asserts that there were certain inscriptions on some columns at the boundary of the Median Empire, which intimated that Cyrus, at the age of one hundred years, died of grief when he heard of the cruelties of his son.

Such are the contradictions and discrepancies of the Greek writers respecting Cyrus, from which it is evident that we must receive with great doubt the common accounts of the life of this prince, as not only apocryphal, but in many respects fabulous. Chronologists are still divided as to the dates assigned to events in Scripture; those inserted in our Bible by Bishop Lloyd, and founded upon the Hebrew copy of the Old Testament, rest upon the authority of Archbishop Usher, whose Chronology has been esteemed the best. On the other hand, we are informed by the most satisfactory authority that the Persian histories before the time of Mahomet have no dates—that we can only compute by the number of years they assign to each reign—that this computation must become more difficult and erroneous in proportion to the remoteness of the period—and that, as it respects the time of Cyrus, the difference which exists in all Oriental authors precludes us from placing confidence in any of them—none of their accounts of the lineage, disposition, history, or the number of years the several kings reigned, coinciding, or indeed having much connection with each other. To whom, then, or to what authentic quarter, can we apply for information respecting the history of the ancient Persian kings? If even the Greek writers disagree among themselves, and contradict each other, what confidence can be placed in the Oriental writers who utterly disregard dates, more especially when we consider their superabundance of that

national vanity, "which preserves only the records of its prosperity and glory, and either blots out altogether, or covers with fable, the traditions of its misfortunes or disgrace?"

The Oriental historians designate Cyrus by the title of Kai Khoosroo, but Sir John Malcolm informs us that this title was "common to many sovereigns of Persia, and the dynasty of the Sassanians are always termed in Roman history the *Cosroes*, or more properly the *Khoosroos* of Persia."—"The history of Kai Khoosroo," says that distinguished writer, "as given by Eastern authors, corresponds in several points with Herodotus. Siawûsh (the first Cambyses of the Greeks), these state was the son of Kai Khoos, but educated by Roostem. He was compelled, they add, by the intrigues of the Persian court to flee to Afrasiab, the king of Turan, whose daughter he married, and by whom he was afterwards slain. He left a son called Kai Khoosroo, whom Afrasiab also resolved to put to death, lest when he attained manhood he should revenge the death of his father; but the cruel intention of the monarch was defeated by the humanity of his minister, Peeran-Wisa, who preserved the child he had been commanded to destroy; and having, for the purpose of concealment, committed the royal infant to the charge of a shepherd, he directed that he should receive in secret an education suitable to his birth. Afrasiab some time afterwards discovered that his grandson was alive; but having been persuaded that he was an idiot, he abandoned his intention of destroying him. The young prince soon effected his escape to the court of his grandfather Kai Khoos, and was placed upon the throne of Persia during the lifetime of that monarch. The first act of his reign was to make war upon his maternal grandfather, the king of Turan, whose armies were commanded by the minister to whom Kai Khoosroo owed his life. The virtuous Peeran-Wisa was unable to resist a powerful prince, animated by the desire of revenging the blood of his father. He was defeated and slain, and

his death proved a prelude to that of his sovereign, whose territories fell into the possession of his victorious grandson. Kai Khoosroo, after this conquest, and many other great achievements [of which the Persian authors relate none minutely except his wars with Afrasiab], determined to spend the remainder of his life in religious retirement. He proceeded to the spot he had fixed upon, where we are told he disappeared, and his train, among whom were some of the most renowned warriors of Persia, perished in a dreadful tempest. This is a short abstract of the reign of this prince as given by Firdewsi. It abounds with fable, and we can trace few historical facts. The poet has judiciously chosen a period so glorious to his country to dilate on the deeds of his heroes, and as neither he nor his readers were acquainted with Media, or with the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian empires, except under the general names of *Sham* and *Room*, which mean Syria and Asia Minor, he makes Persia and Turan the theatre of all their actions."

To show still farther the difficulty which prevails respecting Cyrus, it is even doubted whether the *Coresb* of Isaiah is the Cyrus of the Greeks. The following are the observations of Mr Richardson on this subject, in his learned Dissertation prefixed to his Persian, Arabic, and English Dictionary, which are here laid before the reader without any comment, to show the difficulties which attend any investigation of the subject. "The Grecians have given us the history of a Persian king called Κῆρος which we translate Cyrus. Isaiah prophesies that a prince named *Coresb* will release the Jews from captivity, and order the rebuilding of the Temple. To reconcile these two princes has been considered as an object of high importance, and much learning has been employed to embarrass a much more simple and satisfactory chronology. The Jewish larger chronicle and Josephus finish the building of the Temple only about *thirty-four years* before the fall of the Persian

Empire; the Samaritan interruptions had protracted the completion of the work nearly *twenty years*; the Macedonian conquest took place about the year (B.C.) 331; to which, if we add the *fifty-four years* above mentioned, the proclamation of Coresh must have been issued about the year (B.C.) 385. But the death of Cyrus is placed, by the concurrence of our chronologers, in (B.C.) 529, or *one hundred and fifty-four years* before this period, and he, therefore, *could not be the prince alluded to by Isaiah*. As a confirmation of the probability of the Jewish dates, Josephus expressly mentions that Sanballat, the Samaritan governor, who had given so much interruption to the building of the Temple, *was alive in the time of Alexander*, which is extremely possible by the above chronology, but by the common system he must then have exceeded two hundred years of age. Jaddua was the high priest who met Alexander on his return from the siege of Tyre, in the year (B.C.) 332. Now, by the sacred writings we find that Jaddua was the fifth in succession from Jeshua, who, together with Zerubbabel, conducted home the captive Jews. This event, if connected with the Grecian Cyrus, must have been in the year (B.C.) 536, or two hundred and four years before the above mentioned meeting, which happened in the seventh year of Jaddua's priesthood. As Jeshua was probably advanced in age when commissioned with Zerubbabel to lead the captive people home, seventeen years may be a full allowance for his dignity subsequent to that period, which leaves forty-five years each to the other four—a term far beyond all calculation and probability, especially as the Jewish high priesthood was remarkable for a very quick succession. The opinion and records of the Jews, when fixing the chronology of the building of this Temple—an event which must have made a powerful impression upon the minds of the whole nation—ought indeed to have been decisive, where no opposition especially was found to the Canonical Books. But for no reason that

can apparently be discovered, excepting to force the *Coresh* of Isaiah to be the Cyrus of the Greeks, have our commentators laboured to involve a plain narrative in darkness, and to create with many a doubt of the whole, because there appeared irreconcilable contradictions in the parts."

These are very important observations, and if they fail to convince, they certainly illustrate the great and almost insuperable difficulties which must be encountered in any inquiry into the ancient history of the Oriental countries. Another source of perplexity arises from the manner in which the Jewish chronology is interwoven with that of the Babylonians, Medes, and Persians. Dr Hales, moreover, well observes, that "the confusion of names is embarrassing"—the royal title of Abasuerus being "applied to Xerxes (Ezra iv. 6), to Artaxerxes Longimanus (Esther i. 1), and to Astyages, the father of Cyaxares, or of Darius the Mede (Dan. ix. 1)." Again, "Darius, king of Persia," denotes Darius Hystaspes (Ezra iv. 5-24), but "Darius the Persian" is Darius Nothus (Neh. xiii. 22).

The common account of this intricate part of ancient history connected with the Old Testament, and which is supported by the most learned commentators, is to the following effect. After the destruction of the Assyrian Empire and the Hebrew monarchy, the great ruling powers in what was then known of Asia were the Babylonians and the Medes,—the former governing the countries west of the Tigris, and the latter those east of that river. The kingdom of Lydia, not noticed in the Scriptures, arose in Asia Minor, and continued in great splendour till it was subdued by Cyrus. Such was the state of affairs when Cyrus was born. His father was a Persian nobleman of the Achæmenides, the noblest of the Persian tribes, and one to which their king belonged. His mother was a daughter of the Median king Astyages, called Abasuerus, Dan. ix. 1. Setting aside the fables which Herodotus has admitted into his history respecting the

birth and early education of Cyrus, it may be observed that this prince continued to reside with his parents in Persia, and was brought up in the peculiar discipline and manners of the Persians. His education, as described by Xenophon, entirely agrees with the Persian mode of rearing princes and nobles at that time, though the severity of its discipline might have been somewhat restricted by the luxury which then prevailed. When in the twelfth year of his age he accompanied his mother to Ecbatana, to visit his grandfather Astyages, and he gained the affections of the Medes by his activity, affability, and excellent dispositions. As he grew up he was distinguished by his noble qualities and successful enterprises. In the sixteenth year of his age he acquired great reputation by an expedition against the Babylonians, undertaken by Astyages to revenge an assault which Evil-Merodach had made on Media, while he was engaged in a hunting excursion. Cyrus married the daughter of his uncle Cyaxares (Darius the Mede); and when Astyages died, and the latter ascended the throne, his relationship and right to the succession procured for him a great ascendancy over his uncle, and he became virtually the ruler of the empire. Evil-Merodach was succeeded at Babylon by Belshazzar, who was slain on the night that Daniel interpreted the mysterious handwriting on the wall, and declared that his empire had been given to the Medes and Persians.

The defeat which Cyrus gave the Babylonians was rendered more fatal by the weakness and effeminacy of Belshazzar. The cruelty and tyranny of the last kings of Babylon formed a striking contrast to the mild and generous conduct of Cyrus, and various nations, tributary to the Babylonians, revolted to him. Against one of these Belshazzar appeared with an army to punish the revolt, but Cyrus put him to flight, pursued him to the walls of Babylon, and captured some of his fortresses. Perceiving that the Medes were daily becoming more powerful, Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, used

every exertion to put the empire, and at least Babylon, into a state of defence. Belshazzar in the meantime had called Croesus, king of Lydia, to his assistance, who took the command of a large army against Cyrus, raised in Asia Minor from among the Thracians, Greeks, and others. The Lydian king consulted the most celebrated oracles respecting the result of the war, and interpreted their ambiguous answers to his own advantage; but the fatal termination of the expedition evinced to him the fallacy of the responses, when a hidden meaning was found for them, of a tendency altogether different.

The spies of Cyrus sent him accurate intelligence of the movements of his enemies, and he finally forced Croesus to action, put his cavalry to flight by the use of camels, and routed his whole army. The Lydian king immediately retired to his capital of Sardis, and the approach of winter induced his allies to return; but scarcely had he intimated to his auxiliaries that they were to be ready to take the field in the following summer, when Cyrus unexpectedly approached Sardis with his victorious troops. The city was captured in fourteen days, and Croesus is said to have been spared by invoking in a melancholy tone the name of Solon. This victory was gained in the eighth year of Belshazzar's reign, and in the fifty-seventh of the Captivity.

Asia Minor, including all the country west of the Euphrates, was now reduced to the dominion of Cyaxares, and in the tenth year of Belshazzar's reign Cyrus defeated the Babylonians, not far from their celebrated city, and marched without opposition to that great metropolis, which he immediately invested. The place was considered impregnable; its high and strong walls were surmounted by lofty towers, and surrounded by broad and deep ditches; and its large magazines and numerous stores seemed to secure its inhabitants from all the assaults of the besiegers. Nevertheless, Cyrus continued the siege of the city, and employed each month a twelfth part of his army in

the service. Every effort, however, had been hitherto in vain, until a stratagem finally made him master of the city. Belshazzar was slain, and Babylon subjected to the dominion of Darius the Mede, otherwise Cyaxares II., in the forty-ninth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the sixty-seventh of the Captivity. Cyaxares reigned two years after this great event, and after his death Cyrus inherited the whole Median empire, which in this manner passed from the Medes to the Persians, and was denominated from both people. If what Herodotus relates is correct, that he was obliged to employ force to establish his authority, it was probably in consequence of the refusal of the Medes to acknowledge his right to the succession.

Xenophon informs us that Cyrus, after the death of his uncle Cyaxares, subdued Egypt. He resided during the seven cool months of the year at Babylon, which lost little or nothing of its splendour or strength by the change of its masters, two months in the spring at Shushan or Susa, and during three months of the hot weather at Ecbatana—a practice which his successors followed. He died in the seventh year of his reign, having always treated the Hebrews with great kindness and consideration, and was interred at Pasargata, probably Persepolis, in a small tomb, which seems to be the same as that discovered and described by Niebuhr. It is said that he was about seventy years of age at the time of his death. He was succeeded by his son Cambyzes.

Cyrus is represented as one of the greatest princes recorded in history, and his reign is invariably noticed as the

model of a perfect government, which it could not be unless justice had been its basis and foundation. His character has received the highest eulogiums from ancient and modern authors; he is celebrated for his virtue, prudence, temperance, wisdom, mildness, and generosity. Cicero observes, that during the whole of his government he was never known to utter an angry expression, which is a remarkable instance of self-command. He often declared that a prince should consider himself as a shepherd, and exercise the same vigilance, care, and goodness; and we are informed that it was his invariable maxim that all his purposes and labours should tend to the happiness of his people. He studied to render himself affable and easy of access, affecting no self-importance and haughtiness of demeanour, but making real merit the foundation of his greatness, and he was compensated by the cordial respect of his people. These are splendid tributes to one who had it in his power to wield the sceptre of Oriental despotism in the most tyrannical manner, but who, nevertheless, conducted himself by the noblest principles of magnanimity, justice, and generosity.

The history of Cyrus, it will be perceived from this sketch, is involved in great obscurity, and the question of his identity with the Coresh of Isaiah may be said to be still undecided, on account of the difficulty of reconciling conflicting chronological dates. But the Cyrus whom the Greeks have immortalized was honoured during his life for his justice and kindness to his subjects, and long after his death he was regarded as the father of his people.

D

DANIEL, one of the four great Prophets, was of the tribe of Judah, and of very distinguished if not of royal descent. Josephus informs us that he was of the family of Zedekiah, the last king of

Judah before the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuzaradan. His relationship to the royal family seems to be intimated in the first chapter of his Prophecy, where we find Nebuchadnezzar

at Babylon directing the chief of his eunuchs to "bring certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes; children (or young men) in whom was no blemish, but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldees." These were to be supported at the expense of the king during three years, and to have "a daily provision of the king's meat, and of the wine which he drank." Among these were the distinguished Prophet Daniel, and his three celebrated companions Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, better known by the names of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego.

While Daniel was very young, according to some only twelve years of age, though others conjecture that he was in his eighteenth year, he was carried captive from Jerusalem to Babylon, in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah. He was selected, with a number of Hebrew young men, among whom were the three above mentioned, to be placed under the tuition of Ashpenaz, the master of the eunuchs, to be instructed in the language and literature of the Chaldeans, before they were admitted into the presence of Nebuchadnezzar, and received appointments in his service. This custom of selecting youths, who have fine persons and other external accomplishments, to fill offices of trust and distinction, is very ancient and general among the Oriental nations. The command of Nebuchadnezzar in this respect, that all the Hebrew young men selected from the captive Jews were to have "no blemish," and to be "well favoured," is finely illustrated by Sir Paul Rycant, in his "Present State of the Ottoman Empire." He informs us that "the youths who are designed for the great offices of the Turkish Empire must be of admirable features and pleasing looks, well shaped in their bodies, and without any defects of nature, for it is conceived that a corrupt and

sordid soul can scarce inhabit in a serene and ingenuous aspect, and I have observed not only in the seraglio, but also in the courts of great men, that their personal attendants have been comely, lusty youths, well habited, and deporting themselves with singular modesty and respect in the presence of their masters." Some alterations have been made in these and other matters by Sultan Mahmoud, but previously, and to a certain extent even now, the pages of the seraglio and officers of the Turkish court were originally Christian boys, bought or stolen in time of peace, or taken captive in war, the finest and most capable of whom were sent to the palace, and those selected were placed under the charge of the chief of the white eunuchs, and educated in the religion of their masters in the schools within the palace. It is to be observed, however, that these young men did not themselves become eunuchs, nor did Daniel and his companions, although it has been erroneously inferred that they were so, because they were committed to the care of the chief eunuch.

As the commencement of the Book of Daniel, like the Book of Esther, contains many allusions to the customs of the ancient monarchs of Babylon and Persia, these will be easily understood by illustrating them as we proceed. We are told that the master of the eunuchs "gave names" to Daniel, and his three Hebrew companions specially mentioned—"unto Daniel the name of Belteshazzar (*the prince whom Bel favours, or who lays up treasures in secret*); and to Hananiah, of Shadrach (*tender nipple, or field soft and tender*); and to Mishael, of Meshach (*that draws with force, or that surrounds the waters*); and to Azariah, of Abed-nego" (*servant of light*). This refers to a very ancient custom of several ancient nations, especially in the East. In Turkey, the Christian youths admitted into the palace always received Mahometan names, and in the present case the names are changed from Hebrew to Babylonian, although there was no change in their religion. "Similar instances," says Mr

Richardson, "are innumerable. It was even common in Greece. Plato was originally named Aristo. When Esther was selected from amongst other virgins for the royal choice, her former name Haddassah was dropt, and a new one given to her, in Persian signifying a *star*." This learned Oriental scholar then notices the present instances of Daniel and his companions, and adds, "All nations, we may also observe, have had a greater or less partiality for metonymical and metaphorical allusions, and many persons have been often described by some peculiar attribute or title which was perfectly well understood by those to whom the speech or writing was addressed, though by no means obvious to others without a key." Daniel, however, continues to call himself by his own name throughout his Prophetical Book, and it is therefore probable that the Hebrew captives did not acknowledge the names bestowed upon them by their masters among themselves.

The young Hebrews had resolved, however, not to participate in the order of Nebuchadnezzar respecting the food assigned to them, as they would have been probably compelled to eat in some cases what was absolutely prohibited by the Mosaic Law, and as it would interfere with the peculiar observances of their nation. Daniel had secured the favour of the chief of the eunuchs, and he preferred a request that he and his friends would be allowed to dispense with the king's provisions, and to receive for their sustenance in the stead thereof "pulse to eat, and water to drink." The chief eunuch expressed great hesitation to comply. He informed him that the king had appointed their food, which was assigned them to conduce to their healthy and fair appearance, and that if he (the king) should perceive from their countenances that they looked worse than the others, his own life would be in danger. To all this Daniel replied, "Prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days; and let them give us pulse to eat, and water to drink. Then let our countenances be looked

upon before thee, and let the countenance of the children that eat of the portion of the king's meat; and as thou seest, deal with thy servants." The request was granted, and at the end of the ten specified days their appearance was such as to warrant the chief eunuch continuing their diet of pulse and water without incurring any danger to himself. In this manner they continued during the three years of their education in the Chaldean learning, when they were brought before Nebuchadnezzar. The progress and the accomplishments of Daniel and his three companions exceeded his sanguine expectations. We are told that "in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm."

In the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign from the death of his father, which was the fourth year after he took Jerusalem, Daniel gave his first prophecy which was the interpretation of the king's extraordinary dream which had gone altogether from his memory, yet which had made a powerful impression on his mind. In this part of the history we have a remarkable illustration of ancient Oriental despotism. He summoned the diviners and others to his presence, and told them the circumstance of his having a dream which he had entirely forgotten, and commanded them to discover what it was, and explain it to him. The Chaldean Magi acknowledged their utter inability to do so, at the same time assuring the king that if he could acquaint them with the dream, they would lay before him the interpretation. But this reply made Nebuchadnezzar the more resolute. He again told them that he did not recollect it, and he intimated to them that if they showed him the dream and the interpretation, he would advance them all to great honours, and bestow on them rich rewards, but that if they failed, refused, or were unable to do so, he would "cut them in pieces" alive, and "make their houses a dunghill." The Magi repeated their

former reasonable statement, to which Nebuchadnezzar replied that he perceived their real purpose was to procure delay, that his attention to other affairs might make him forget this—and that if they could not bring the dream to his recollection, there was no other alternative than to inflict the punishment of death. The unfortunate Magi, placed in this disagreeable situation, ventured another remonstrance. “There is not a man,” they said, “upon the earth that can show the king’s matters, therefore there is no king, lord, nor ruler, that asked any such things at any magician, or astrologer, or Chaldean: and it is a rare thing that the king requireth, and there is none other that can show it before the king except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh.” This moderate and reasonable reply put Nebuchadnezzar into a furious rage, and he instantly issued a decree ordering all the Magi to be put to death, either for imposing upon him, or for obstinately refusing to comply with his arbitrary will.

This decree included Daniel and his companions, for we are told that “they sought him and his fellows to be slain.” He immediately sought an interview with Arioch, the captain of the guard, who had received peremptory orders to put the Magi to death, interposed in their behalf, and had an audience of Nebuchadnezzar, from whom he requested time, and he promised not only to tell him the nature of the dream, but to give him the interpretation. The king consented, and Daniel retired to his house, where he made known the whole transaction to his companions, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, desiring them to unite with him in supplications to God that the secret might be communicated to him, to preserve them and the Magi from destruction. Assured of the divine protection, Daniel repaired to the captain of the guard, and requested to be brought before Nebuchadnezzar. He was admitted, and the king asked him if he was able to make known unto him the dream and the interpretation. The Hebrew Prophet ascribed the know-

ledge he had acquired to a divine communication, and not to any superior wisdom which he possessed. He observed that the secret which the king demanded from the “astrologers, the magicians, and the soothsayers,” was utterly beyond their power to discover, “but,” said he, “there is a God in heaven who revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the *latter days*”—a phrase which often signifies the times of the Messiah, called the *last times* or *age* of the world, and in this sense the expression may be understood here, for the prophecy contained in Nebuchadnezzar’s vision reaches to the establishment of the Messiah’s kingdom. On this subject St Jerome, as quoted by Bishop Newton, has a fine practical observation. The impious king, he says, “had a prophetic dream, that, the saint interpreting it, God might be glorified, and the captives, and those who served God in captivity, might receive great consolation.”

Daniel then proceeded to make known to Nebuchadnezzar his dream, to which the latter listened with profound attention, and he afterwards gave him the interpretation. The object of this extraordinary dream was a great image, the form of which was terrible—an admirable emblem of human power and dominion, and in ancient coins and medals it is common to see cities and nations represented by human figures male and female. It is said of the image which Nebuchadnezzar saw, that its “brightness was excellent,” on which Grotius acutely remarks, that this image appeared with a glorious lustre to the imagination of the king of Babylon, whose mind was entirely absorbed by worldly pomp and splendour. The image consisted of four different metals—gold, silver, brass (copper), and iron, which typified so many kingdoms. This last idea, of expressing the condition of things by metallic symbols, was prevalent before the time of Daniel, and appears to have been common in antiquity. The order of the succession of these kingdoms is clearly de-

noted by the order of the parts, the head and higher parts signifying the times in which Nebuchadnezzar lived, and the lower parts the latter times. The "head of the image was of fine gold," which Daniel interpreted as referring to Nebuchadnezzar himself, his family, and representatives, addressing him as a powerful monarch, whose empire was large and extensive.—"Thou, O king, art a king of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory; and wherever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of heaven hath he given into thine hands, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold." Those ancient historians, fragments of whose works are yet preserved, speak of this ancient Oriental conqueror's extensive empire, and describe him as holding in subjection Egypt, Syria, Phœnicia, and Arabia, some alleging that he even subdued the greatest part of Lybia and Spain, proceeding to the Pillars of Hercules, and leading his army out of Spain into Thrace and Pontus. But this Empire was of no long duration—it ended with his descendant Belshazzar, little more than twenty-three years after Nebuchadnezzar's death. The other parts of the image denote the great Empires which were to rise successively. The breast and the arms of the image were of silver, which Daniel interprets, "And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." This, it is universally agreed, denotes the Medo-Persian Empire, which arose on the ruins of the Babylonian—an Empire said to be *inferior*, or *less* than the latter, because neither Cyrus nor his successors carried their arms into Africa and Spain, as Nebuchadnezzar is reported to have done; or *worse* than the Babylonian, because, as Dr Prideaux observes, the Persian kings were often the worst race of princes who ever governed an empire. Josephus observes, in reference to this image, that the two hands and the two shoulders signify that the Babylonian Empire was to be dissolved by two kings

—those of the Medes and Persians, whose power was united under Cyrus.

We are farther told that the "belly and thighs" of this image were of brass, which Daniel interprets, "Another third kingdom of brass which shall bare rule over all the earth." Alexander the Great conquered the Persian Empire, and therefore the Macedonian Empire is here intended. This Empire, Bishop Newton observes, was fitly represented by brass, for the Greeks were famous for their brazen armour—their usual designation being the *brazen-coated Greeks*. This kingdom was to "bear rule over all the earth"—not that even Alexander literally conquered the whole world, or anything approximating to it, but his empire consisted of extensive countries and kingdoms in Europe, Asia, and Africa; and we are informed by several ancient writers that ambassadors came from almost all parts of the known world to congratulate him on his success, and to submit to his power. The two "thighs of brass" in all probability intimate the Seleucian kings of Syria and the Ptolemy of Egypt—two monarchies which arose out of the Macedonian Empire, for they alone of all Alexander's successors had any connection with the Jewish church and nation.

The legs of this image were "of iron, his feet part of iron, and part of clay." This fourth kingdom is described by Daniel as stronger than the preceding, "forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things." This denotes the Roman Empire, which succeeded the Macedonian. Its soldiers reduced the kingdoms of the Seleucidæ and of the Ptolemy to Roman provinces, but as the "iron" was mixed with "miry clay," in like manner the Romans held rule over a mixture of barbarous nations, and thus the toes of the image, partly iron and partly clay, must denote the several kingdoms, some strong and some weak, which arose out of the ruins of that magnificent Empire, which did not "cleave one to another, even as iron is not mingled with clay;" and we know that the Roman

Empire was subsequently divided into ten lesser kingdoms or *horns*, corresponding to the ten toes of the image.

But the dream and its interpretation were not yet concluded. Daniel continued—"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it break in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold, the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter; and the dream is certain, and the interpretation sure." This last empire, typified by the stone cut without hands, is by the Jews referred to the kingdom of their still expected Messiah—a strong corroboration of the interpretation which applies it to the kingdom of Christ, whatever may be the various modifications, explanations, and hypotheses of commentators, for that kingdom was set up during the dominion of the Romans,—our blessed Saviour was born during the reign of Augustus Cæsar, one of the most illustrious Emperors, and the Gospel was preached when the Empire was in its zenith of greatness, and comprehended what was then commonly said to be *all the world*. The stone was to be a thing totally different from the image, which represented temporal monarchies—it was "cut out without hands;" and hence the kingdom of the Messiah is spiritual, different from those of the world, set up by the God of heaven, who, in the fulness of time, sent his only-begotten Son into the world to renovate the nations, and to bring life and immortality to light by the Gospel. The "stone which the builders rejected has become the chief stone of the corner; it is the Lord's doing, and wonderful in our eyes." In other words, "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever," Rev. xi. 15.

Nebuchadnezzar listened to the young Hebrew, who was then, it is conjectured, twenty-two years of age, with feelings of astonishment and veneration, and no sooner had he concluded than he paid him the highest tokens of respect in unison with Oriental manners, commanding "that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours unto him." He also acknowledged to Daniel—"Of a truth it is that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of lords, and a Revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldest reveal this thing." The Prophet, liberally rewarded and honoured by the king, was not unmindful of his three companions in bondage, and by his recommendation they were preferred to places of importance in the province of Babylon.

Some years after this Daniel had acquired such a character for wisdom, piety, and virtue, that he is proverbially mentioned, as it were, by the Prophet Ezekiel in his ironical address to the king of Tyre. "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee:" and in another place, in declaring the punishment to be inflicted on obstinate nations and communities he is thus introduced—"Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter, they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness." The mention of the holy Patriarchs Noah and Job requires no explanation, but it is a most distinguished honour conferred upon Daniel, who was then living, and who had been about fourteen years in captivity, to be joined with them in this pointed manner. It moreover appears from his own Book that he was the most conspicuous and remarkable man of the Hebrew nation of his time, whether we regard his exalted piety or the influential place which he occupied at the Babylonian court. After the end of the Jewish war Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon, and out of the spoils collected in that expedition he made a golden image in honour of his idol Bel or Belus, in the Plain of Dura,

in the neighbourhood of Babylon. On the occasion of the dedication of it he summoned all his officers to attend, and issued a proclamation that universal homage should be rendered. Daniel's three friends, however, refused, and were thrown into a fiery furnace, from which they most miraculously escaped unhurt. Daniel himself, who was probably present, and who, it need scarcely be remarked, did not worship the image, was not molested.

In the nineteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, and, it is said, in the thirty-fifth of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar returned from his successful Egyptian expedition to Babylon, and had the remarkable dream about a wonderful large tree, and the cutting of it down, of which we have a minute account in the fourth chapter of the Book of Daniel. The Magi failed to interpret this singular vision, but Daniel again explained the whole mystery, and intimated to the king that it prefigured his own future circumstances—an announcement which was soon remarkably verified, for Nebuchadnezzar was seized with a hypochondriacal madness, and under its influence he ran wild into the fields, where, fancying himself an ox, he actually fed on grass after the manner of cattle. In this state he continued seven years, and such was the awful malady by which Divine Providence thought fit to punish the pride of Nebuchadnezzar! When reason returned the king acknowledged the chastening hand and the sovereign power of the only true God, the King of kings, and Lord of lords:—"Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol, and honour the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and his ways judgment; and those that walk in pride he is able to abase."

We have no more of Daniel's history until the reign of Nabonadius, Nebuchadnezzar's grandson, called in Scripture Belshazzar, in the first year of whose reign he had the vision of the four great beasts, which represented the four great monarchies of the Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks, and Romans, and of the king-

dom of the Messiah which was to succeed them all. It was the same as that made to Nebuchadnezzar under the figure of a great image, which Daniel explained in the remarkable manner already noticed, and now introduced, about forty-eight years afterwards, in the shape of four great wild beasts, which "came up from the sea, diverse one from another." The first is represented as "like a lion, and had eagle's wings," thus denoting the Babylonian Empire, which, by the conjoined figure of the king of beasts and the king of birds, is described as the first and noblest kingdom. The eagle's wings denote swiftness and rapidity, and this amply illustrates the rapidity of the Babylonian conquests—that Empire having advanced to its greatness within a few years under one sovereign—Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel says that in his vision he "beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it,"—the probable meaning of which, as Bishop Newton appropriately remarks, is, that after the Babylonian Empire was subverted the people became more humane and humble, and they who had previously vaunted as if they had been immortal now felt themselves to be but men.

The second kingdom was represented to the Prophet in his vision as "like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs on the mouth of it between the teeth of it, and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh." This is the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, represented by that most voracious and cruel animal the bear, on account of its rapacity and greediness of blood, which is in unison with the description of the Medo-Persians by Jeremiah as great robbers and spoilers. Its three ribs are understood by some commentators to denote the three great kingdoms of the Babylonians, Medes, and Persians, all component parts, and merged into one; but others, with more propriety, view them as intimating Baby-

lon, Lybia, and Egypt, conquered by the Medo-Persians, which, though not properly parts of that Empire, greatly added to its strength, and might be said to be between the teeth of the bear, because they were severely oppressed by the Persians. The cruelty of Cambyzes, Ochus, and others of the ancient Persian princes, is recorded by all historians who have written of their affairs, and in conduct and dispositions they may be said to have resembled bears rather than men.

The third kingdom was represented by a beast "like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads, and dominion was given to it." Here the Macedonian Empire, under Alexander the Great, is clearly intimated, the swiftness of the leopard denoting the astonishing rapidity of that prince's conquests, its spots emblematical of the different nations which he commanded, or of the various dispositions and humours of Alexander himself, who was alternately merciful and cruel, generous and tyrannical, temperate and drunken, abstemious and incontinent, mild and passionate. The Babylonian Empire was represented as a lion with two wings, but the Macedonian as a leopard with four, because, rapid as were the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar, those of Alexander the Great were still more so—that extraordinary hero passing from country to country with a kind of lightning speed, extending his conquests from his small paternal state of Macedonia as far as the Ganges in the short space of twelve years; and the "four heads" of the beast denote the four kingdoms into which the Empire of Alexander was divided by his four captains—Cassander reigning over Macedonia and Greece, Lysimachus over Thrace and Bithynia, Ptolemy over Egypt, and Seleucus over Syria.

The fourth kingdom is represented by "a beast dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it, and it was diverse from all the beasts

that were before it, and it had ten horns." Daniel does not describe the shape of this beast, but St John has supplied the deficiency in the Apocalypse, representing it as a combination of the three others in their distinctive qualities, having "the body of the leopard, the feet of the bear, and the mouth of the lion," and exceeding them by having seven heads, but with the same number of ten horns, which marks its identity with Daniel's fourth beast. The Prophet was curious to know particularly what this beast could mean, and was answered by the angel Gabriel—in these words:—"The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall rise, and another shall rise after them, and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws, and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times, and the dividing of time." The fourth kingdom indicated by this extraordinary beast is the Roman Empire, which was "dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly," beyond any of the former. Within one hundred and fifty years before the Christian era the Romans had reduced the kingdoms of Macedonia, Pergamus, Syria, and Egypt—they were masters of Europe, of a great part of Asia and Africa, and all Asia Minor—their sway was acknowledged from the Ultima Thule of the Northern Ocean to the gorgeous plains of Syria and the fertile oases of Egypt, and this stupendous Empire became almost what the Roman writers delighted to consider it—the Empire of the world.

This beast, typifying the Roman Empire, had "seven horns," which denote that so many kingdoms were to arise out of it, according to the usual phraseology of Scripture. We must consequently look

for these kingdoms amid the dismemberment of the Roman Empire by the incursions of the Northern nations, and these have been variously enumerated by different writers, the *ten kingdoms*, it will be recollected, having previously been represented by the *ten toes* of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, so that the grand idea is preserved throughout the prophetic visions. Dr Hales gives a list of the *ten kingdoms* from Machiavelli, of notorious name—"the best," he alleges, "because the most unprejudiced authority, in his History of Florence, with their respective dates, furnished by Bishop Lloyd." 1. The Huns (Hungary), about A.D. 356. 2. The Ostro-Goths (Mæsia-Italy), A. D. 377. 3. The Visigoths, A.D. 378 (Pannonia). 4. The Franks, A.D. 407 (Gaul). 5. The Vandals, A.D. 407 (Africa). 6. The Suevi, A. D. 407 (Spain). 7. The Burgundians, A.D. 407 (Burgundy). 8. The Heruli, A.D. 476 (Italy). 9. The Saxons, A.D. 476 (Britain). 10. The Longobards, A. D. 483 (Danube), or Lombardy, A.D. 526. Mede enumerates them from A.D. 456, the year after Rome was sacked by Genseric, king of the Vandals, in the following manner—the Britons or Saxons in Britain, the Franks and Burgundians in France, the Visigoths in the south of France and part of Spain, the Suevi and Alani in Galicia and Portugal, the Vandals in Africa, the Alemanni in Germany, the Ostro-Goths, succeeded by the Longobards in Pannonia, and afterwards in Italy, and the Greeks in the residue of the Empire. Sir Isaac Newton, in his Observations on Daniel, gives a somewhat different enumeration, but on the same principle. He reckons the kingdoms of the Alani and Vandals in Spain and Africa, that of the Suevi in Spain, of the Visigoths, of the Alani in Gaul, of the Burgundians, the Franks, the Britons, the Huns, the Lombards, and the kingdom of Ravenna. Besides these ten horns or kingdoms, a "little horn" was to spring up among them, on which there are various opinions, some seeking it in the Western Roman Emperor, but it is commonly understood

to indicate the Pope or Bishop of Rome, whose power was originally extremely limited, until his "horn" as a temporal sovereign was established in the eighth century. Well may we exclaim with Bishop Newton—"What an amazing prophecy is this, comprehending so many various events, and extending through so many successive ages, from the first establishment of the Persian Empire, upwards of five hundred and thirty years before Christ, to the general resurrection! What a proof of a Divine Providence, and of a Divine Revelation! For who could thus declare the things that shall be, with their times and seasons, but He only who hath them in His power, whose dominion is over all, and whose kingdom endureth from generation to generation!"

In the third year of the reign of Belshazzar we find Daniel at the palace of Shushan, or Susa, one of the royal cities of Persia, and the capital of a district which, from this circumstance, must then have been subject to the Babylonians. Here he had the vision of the ram and the he-goat, prefiguring the overthrow of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great. In this vision we have again two animals, denoting two Empires, the Babylonian being omitted, because its existence had nearly terminated. The ram with two horns, according to the explication of the angel Gabriel, which immediately follows the vision, was the Empire of the Medes and Persians united under Cyrus, born of Median and Persian parents. The propriety of the emblem is evident when it is considered that it was customary for the Persian kings to wear, instead of a diadem, a ram's head made of gold, and adorned with precious stones; and various travellers inform us, that rams' heads with horns, one higher and one lower, are still to be seen on the pillars of Persepolis, the supposed Pasargata, where Cyrus was buried. The exploits of the ram are thus described by Daniel:—"I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward, so that no beasts might stand before him, neither

was there any that could deliver out of his hand, but he did according to his will, and became great." The Prophet saw the ram "standing," that is, established in his strength, and then butting "westward, and northward, and southward." In confirmation of this prophetic vision, it is well known that the Persians under Cyrus subdued Lybia, Babylonia, and Egypt, with their dependencies, the three ribs in the bear's mouth represented in the former vision; and, to be more minute, the Persians extended their conquests *westward* as far as the *Ægean* Sea and the boundaries of Asia; *northward*, they subdued the Armenians, Cappadocians, and other nations; and, *southward*, they conquered Egypt. Under Darius they reduced a great part of India. The ram did "according to his will, and became great," which is proved from the fact that none of the neighbouring kingdoms were able to withstand the power of the Persians; and in the reign of a successor of Cyrus, their Empire had been enlarged to such a degree, that it extended "from India even unto Ethiopia, over an hundred and twenty-seven provinces," being seven provinces additional to what it contained in the time of Cyrus.

The other animal in the vision is the he-goat, "which came from the west on the face of the earth, and touched not the ground, and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes." The angel Gabriel gives the explication, that the "rough goat is the king of Grecia, and the great horn that is between the eyes is the first king." This is universally admitted to describe Alexander the Great, and it is a singular coincidence that when this conqueror claimed to be the son of Jupiter Ammon, who was worshipped under the figure of a ram, and who, when represented in the human form, had ram's horns on his head, he endeavoured to assume the symbols which denoted his alleged parentage, causing his head to be represented as horned. In the Bodleian Library at Oxford there is an ancient medal containing the head of Alexander thus delineated, and the Mahometans of

the East still recognize the horns of this conqueror, and in their writings generally style him *The Horned*. But the propriety of the goat being made the emblem of the Macedonian Empire is farther evident from the fact, that a Macedonian king, about two centuries before the time of Daniel, instigated by an oracle, made a goat his ensign, and called his capital city *Ægeæ*, or the *Goat's City*, which long continued to be the usual burying place of the Macedonian kings. The Prophet says that the goat came "from the west," namely, Europe, which lies westward of Asia—that he came "on the face of the whole earth," carrying every thing before him wherever he appeared, and that he "touched not the ground," alluding to the swiftness and rapidity of Alexander's marches and conquests. For the same reason the Macedonian conqueror had been likened in the former vision to a leopard, and to denote still greater quickness and impetuosity, to a leopard with "four wings."

The conquest of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great in the reign of Darius is well known. The Prophet well describes it in his vision—"He (the goat) came to the ram which had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. And I saw him come closer unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns, and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground and stamped upon him, and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand." As the Persians had in two previous reigns poured their armies into Greece, the Greeks in turn visited the Persians, and the he-goat invaded the ram. Daniel saw the ram "standing before the river," and it is well known that the first engagement in which Alexander the Great overthrew the Persians was at the river Granicus in Phrygia. The empire of the goat, as described by Daniel in his prophetic vision, was in its full strength in consequence of the

rapid and extensive conquests of Alexander, when he died at Babylon; but "when he was strong," and in the flower of manhood, "the great horn was broken, and for it came up four notable ones towards the four winds of heaven." Alexander was indeed succeeded by his illegitimate brother, Philip Aridaeus, and by his own two sons, Alexander Ægus and Hercules, but in the space of fifteen years they were all murdered, the royal family of Macedon became extinct, and the "great horn was broken." But in place of it "came up four notable ones," namely, the governors of the provinces which, by the defeat and death of Antigonus at the battle of Issus, were reduced to *four*, and the governors of these provinces, Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus, assumed the titles of kings, whose dominions extended "toward the four winds of heaven."—Cassander, as has been elsewhere noticed, holding Greece and the *western* parts of the great Macedonian Empire; Lysimachus ruling over Thrace, Bithynia, and the *northern* regions; Ptolemy possessing Egypt and the *southern* countries; and Seleucus obtaining Syria and the *eastward* provinces. How wonderfully minute are all these great events intimated, as seen by Daniel in his vision centuries before they took place! These are the four "notable horns" which appeared in the stead of the first great horn, and they correspond to the four heads of the leopard in the former vision.

Daniel farther announces, that out of one of these notable horns "came forth a little horn, which waxed exceedingly great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great even to the host of heaven, and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practised and

prospered;" or, as it is expressed in the marginal reading, "the host was given over for the transgression against the daily sacrifice."

This extraordinary prediction has been supposed to refer to Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, who "came out of," or was successor to, one of the "notable horns"—to the vengeance of God upon him—and to the victories of the Maccabees. Sir Isaac Newton entertains a different opinion, in which he has been followed by Bishop Newton, Dr Hales, and other distinguished commentators. At first sight, Bishop Newton observes, Antiochus Epiphanes does, indeed, in some features very much resemble the "little horn," but on a closer examination it will be found that another party must be intimated. Our views are therefore directed towards the Romans, "who," continues the Bishop, "as they were prefigured by a *great beast* in the former vision, are here represented by the *horn of the goat*, for nothing is more natural than to describe the same person or thing under different images upon different occasions; and, besides, in this vision the Roman Empire is not designed at large, but only the Roman Empire [the Syrian part of it] as the horn of the goat. When the Romans first got footing in Greece they became a horn of the goat. Out of this horn they came, and at first were a *little horn*, but in process of time they overtopped the other horns. From Greece they extended their arms, and overran the other parts of the goat's dominions, and their actions within the dominions of the goat, and not their affairs in the Western Empire, are the principal subjects of this prophecy. But their actions, which are most largely and particularly specified, are their great persecutions and oppressions of the people of God, which renders it probable that the appellation of the *little horn* might be given them for the same reason that the great persecutor and oppressor of the saints in the Western Empire is also called the *little horn*. It is the same kind of power, and therefore might be signified by the same thing."

The actions of this "little horn" certainly indicate the Roman power rather than the temporary oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes. Daniel says that he "waxed exceeding great," and so did the Romans even within the territory of the goat. They conquered Egypt "toward the south," which they retained for several centuries; they grew powerful "toward the east," making Syria, the eastern kingdom of the goat, a tributary province; and "toward the pleasant land" they directed their martial energies, for they subdued Judea, made a province of the country, destroyed the Temple and city of Jerusalem, and so completely dispersed the Jews that they have never been able to recover their position as a nation. They "waxed great, even to the host of heaven," signifying either the Jewish state in general, or the priests and Levites in particular, who are called *stars*, on account of their station and knowledge, and the "host of heaven," because they watched and served in the Temple. The Romans also "magnified themselves against the Prince of the host," by condemning and crucifying the Messiah, and by them "the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down," for they utterly desolated Jerusalem, leaving not one stone upon another. The other expressions evidently allude to the grievous miseries, the utter extirpation of the Jewish state, and the devastation made by the Romans under Titus Vespasian, when "the stars fell from heaven, and the powers of the heavens were shaken." But the real explication can hardly be mistaken if we attend to what the angel stated to Daniel. The Prophet informs us that immediately after his vision he heard a man's voice on the banks of Ulai, "which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision." Daniel was so overpowered by the Divine Presence, that he fell on his face towards the ground in a deep sleep or trance, till Gabriel touched him, restored him to consciousness, and then explained to him more particularly the former historical

part of the vision, concluding with a reference to the latter chronological part, or vision of the "evening mornings," that it was *true*, or would be verified by the accomplishment, which was remote, or "for many days," and that the vision was "shut up," or sealed—its farther disclosure hid for the present. The whole Roman character at home and abroad, in public or in private, in peace or in war, is accurately delineated by the angel. It is represented as a "king of fierce countenance," who was to "stand up against," in other words, to become the judge of, "the Prince of princes," for though it was by the malice of the Jews, it was by the authority of the Romans that the Messiah was put to death, and he suffered the punishment of their malefactors and slaves. "The word rendered *shall stand up against*," says Dr Zouch, "is probably used here, as in other passages of Scripture, in a forensic sense, and expresses in most vivid colours the judicial proceedings of the Roman judge against Jesus Christ, for that by the *Prince of princes* is here meant Jesus Christ will admit of little doubt. This splendid title is properly applied to him who is called the *Prince of the kings of the earth*, the Lord of lords, and King of kings, the Prince of peace, whose 'dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away,' to whom all power was given in heaven and in earth, and who, like a triumphant conqueror, led 'captivity captive;' or *to stand up against the Prince of princes* may be interpreted to oppose his authority by persecuting his faithful servants and depreciating their merit, and thus to wage war against him and his religion. The page of history is stained with deeds of exquisite cruelty and inhuman barbarity exercised by the Romans against the first professors of Christianity, and while the supreme magistrate of Rome indulged himself in the various modes of torture, the zeal of the historian was equally exerted in debasing the characters of innocent men, and branding their religion with odious appellations."

Daniel informs us that after the vision and its partial explanation he fainted, and was sick many days, so much was he affected with the misfortunes and afflictions which were to try the faith and patience of the people of God. This regard for his religion and his country exhibits him in a very amiable light, and gives additional lustre to his character. He says that he was "astonished at the vision, but none understood it," from which it appears that he had communicated it to his companions. He then proceeded to transact the king's business in the high official situation in which he was placed.

We now come to one of the most remarkable events of Daniel's life, in which he saw the actual verification of one of his own prophecies intimated in the explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. In the seventeenth year of his reign Belshazzar held a great feast at Babylon, on the occasion of an annual festival, when the whole night was spent in revelling and debauchery. The Persians, under Cyrus, had invested the city for a considerable time, but they had made no impression on its immense walls and strong fortifications. Babylon was so advantageously provided with stores, and so amply supplied from its internal resources, that its inhabitants were apparently secure for ever from the attacks of their enemies, and they had every reason to hope that the besiegers would relinquish their enterprise in despair. They were accordingly in high spirits, and derided the Persians from their walls and towers, little thinking that Cyrus, to all appearance pressing the siege with the greatest vigour, that they might not suspect his designs, had actually made preparations to change the course of the Euphrates, which ran through the city. But Jehovah had determined the doom of the mighty Babylon, and that eventful night was to seal the fate of one of the proudest and most powerful empires of antiquity.—"I will make drunk her princes, and her wise men, her captains, and her rulers, and her mighty men, and

they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the King whose name is the Lord of hosts."

On this the last night of the existence of the Babylonian Empire, Belshazzar "made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand; and whiles he tasted the wine, he commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father (grandfather) Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem, that the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, might drink therein." The expression, *whiles he tasted the wine*, seems to allude to that part of the libation in which the wine was tasted at the time of a sacrifice, or a festal solemnity. This *impious king*, as he is called by Xenophon, in making these libations, ordered the sacred vessels, consecrated to the service of Jehovah, to be introduced for these unhallowed purposes, thus prostituting the instruments of the Temple of the true God to the idolatrous rites of Pagan superstition, or, if the impiety was not to this extent, at least applying them to common uses, and to the purposes of intemperance and excess. Nebuchadnezzar, in all his acts of folly, pride, and daring, had carefully abstained from such an act of presumption. He had carried off, indeed, the sacred vessels when he became master of Jerusalem, and he had deposited them in the temple of his idol Bel, but he had never allowed them to be applied to any purpose whatsoever. Even his tyrannical son Evil-Merodach, who provoked the general indignation of his own subjects by his atrocities, had prudently refrained from touching those consecrated vessels, and they had remained unpolluted until this ominous command of Belshazzar to introduce them in his impious revelry. They were brought, and the guests "drank in them, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone"—triumphing over that God to whose service they had been consecrated, and extolling their idols. In the midst of this licentious mirth, and while offering

this daring insult to the God of heaven, a mysterious hand, writing certain characters on the wall of the banquet-room, attracted the attention of every one present, and "the king saw the part of the hand that wrote." Whence it came, or what it was, none could say—every guest was paralysed with fear, a general horror seized them, and they felt as if some awful calamity were to involve them in utter destruction. The alarm of Belshazzar is finely described.—"The king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his knees were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." He ordered the Magi to be summoned, and announced to the wise men of Babylon, "Whosoever shall read this writing, and shew me the interpretation thereof, shall be clothed with purple, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall be the third ruler in the kingdom."

The Magi attended the summons of their sovereign, but their learning was useless—they "could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof." The reason of their inability to read the mysterious characters was, that they were written in the primitive Hebrew, which totally differed from the Chaldee. This tended to increase the alarm and horror of Belshazzar. The tidings had spread throughout the palace, and the queen entered the banquet-house at the very time the Magi had confessed their inability to decypher the handwriting. When she was informed of their failure, and saw the consternation of Belshazzar, she thus addressed him:—"O king, live for ever; let not thy thoughts trouble thee, nor let thy countenance be changed. There is a man in thy kingdom in whom is the spirit of the holy gods; and in the days of thy father light and understanding, like the wisdom of the gods, were found in him, whom the king Nebuchadnezzar thy father made master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and soothsayers. Forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding, interpret-

ing of dreams, and shewing of hard sentences, and dissolving of doubts, were found in the same Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar; now let Daniel be called, and he will shew the interpretation."

As we are informed that the "wives and concubines" of Belshazzar were present at the feast, the conjecture that the *queen* here mentioned as entering the banquet-room was Nitocris, the *queen mother*, has every appearance of probability. This is farther strengthened by the intimate knowledge she exhibits of the affairs of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, at the latter end of which, as wife of Evil-Merodach, who acted as regent during his father's temporary insanity, she took an active part in the internal policy of the kingdom, which she continued to do during the reigns of her husband and her son Belshazzar. It appears, however, that the king was unacquainted even with the person of such an eminent and important public officer as Daniel, who had been made master of the Magi by Nebuchadnezzar. When the Hebrew Prophet was introduced, the king asked him, "Art thou that Daniel, who art of the children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my father brought out of Jewry? I have heard (or just been informed) of thee, that the spirit of the gods is in thee, and that light, and understanding, and excellent wisdom, are found in thee." Some have accounted for this ignorance on the part of Belshazzar by referring to his abandoned and indolent character, but Sir John Chardin has advanced a very ingenious and probable solution of the difficulty, by stating that he had been deprived of his office as master of the Chaldean Magi at the death of Nebuchadnezzar. He rests his conclusions on the fact that when a Persian king dies, both his astrologers and physicians are removed from the court—the former for not having predicted, and the latter for not preventing, his death. If such was the etiquette of the ancient Babylonian monarchs, as it was of their successors the Persians, and continues to the pre-

sent day, we have at once a solution of the difficulty, as he may be supposed to have been deprived of his employments, and to have lived in comparative retirement during the reigns of Evil-Merodach and Belshazzar. Yet he had some important official situation in the third year of the reign of the latter, for he then had the prophetic vision of the ram and the he-goat already considered, after which, when he recovered from the indisposition which it caused, he tells us that he "rose up, and did (or attended to) the king's business." This vision was at Shushan in Persia, so that it is evident he had returned to Babylon, and had resided some years in retirement in that city, previous to the mysterious event which introduced him again to the king and the court.

Belshazzar made the same liberal offers to Daniel which he had proffered to any one of the Magi, but these were rejected by the Prophet, at least he informed the king that he would explain to him the handwriting without those inducements, and advised him to bestow his rewards on others. He commenced his address to Belshazzar by a reference to his grandfather Nebuchadnezzar, and the punishment inflicted on him, that, "when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him; and he was driven from the sons of men, and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses; they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till he knew that the Most High God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will. And thou his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this." After pointing out the impious insult offered to Jehovah by polluting the consecrated vessels, and praising the "gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know," Daniel proceeded to decypher the mysterious writing to the alarmed and guilty king.

The words, it is already observed, were written in the ancient Hebrew character, but even if the Chaldean Magi had been able to read them, it would have been beyond their power to supply that interpretation given by Daniel. Dr Hales affords the following explanation, the first word being repeated twice, and the plural of the verb following the singular, to give intensity to the sense. "MENE (number), MENE (number), TEKEL (weight), PERES (division), UPHARSIN (and divisions)." The extended interpretation of which is—"MENE—God hath *numbered* thy reign, and [MENE] hath *finished* it. TEKEL—Thou art *weighed* in the balance, and *found wanting*. PERES—Thy kingdom is *divided*. UPHARSIN—And *given* to the Medes and Persians,"—namely, to Darius and Cyrus.

With whatever feelings Belshazzar listened to his inevitable fate, he nevertheless fulfilled his solemn promise, and the Prophet was proclaimed the third person in the kingdom. But that very night saw the dissolution of the Babylonian monarchy. The Persian army entered the channel of the Euphrates both above and below the city, and pressed into the heart of the proud Babylon before its inhabitants were aware. Belshazzar was killed in the contest, and the victorious Persians became masters of the palace. Darius the Mede, as he is called, otherwise Cyaxares, "took the kingdom," being then in the sixty-eighth year of his age, and thus the first part of the prophecies against the Babylonian Empire and its metropolis was accomplished.

Darius, otherwise Cyaxares, and Cyrus, having concerted a proper division of the empire for facilitating public business, arranged it into one hundred and twenty provinces, to every one of which they appointed a governor, and over those governors three presidents, of whom Daniel was the chief, who were to reside constantly at the court as the king's ministers. He was well entitled to this pre-eminence, as well on account of his long experience as for his remarkable wisdom, having now been employed, from the

second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, fully sixty-five years in official stations under the Babylonian kings. He thus, under the Persian, became the third person or ruler in the empire, if we class Cyrus, the heir apparent, next to the king in dignity. But this high rank exposed Daniel to the jealousy and envy of the other courtiers, and they laid that snare for him which caused him to be cast into the den of lions—an event in his life, which, like the impious feast of Belshazzar, has occupied the attention of some great painters of modern times, as is exemplified in the celebrated picture of Rubens, the original of which is in Hamilton Palace.

It appears that the only point on which Daniel could be assailed in any way by his enemies was his religion. They had tried various schemes to impeach him to the king, but they could find "none occasion or fault, forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him;" and they accordingly were forced to acknowledge—"We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." In all the adulation of Oriental flattery they presented an address to the king, entreating him to issue a "royal statute and firm decree," prohibiting every person from petitioning "any God or man for thirty days" except the king himself, under the penalty of being thrown into a den of lions. Darius complied, and signed the decree, which was now irrevocable, "according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not."

This snare was expressly laid for Daniel, and he was well aware of all the circumstances, yet it had no effect on his conduct—"he went into his house, and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a-day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." His enemies caught him in these acts of devotion, and reported him to the king, reminding him of the edict and its irrevocable nature. When Darius heard

that the accused was Daniel, he was "sore displeased with himself, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him, and he laboured till the going down of the sun to deliver him." The inveterate enemies of Daniel, however, were not to be disappointed, and perceiving the king's favourable disposition towards him, they once more appealed to the peculiar law which existed among them:—"Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, that no decree or statute which the king establisheth may be changed." Here we have another instance of this extraordinary and foolish law of the Persians; and it is not a little remarkable that the only law which seems to have limited the royal power of their kings was one which strongly fortified and maintained that power. The king's word was law, and as the sovereign was viewed as more than human, it was natural on these principles that his declared purpose could not be altered—especially because the yielding on any occasion to justice and mercy after his purpose had been announced, would have been an admission that he had been hasty and mistaken—an idea which the despots of ancient Asia would never entertain. In the case of Daniel we have the king, in consequence of a declaration which he evidently had not thoroughly comprehended at the time, compelled to do what he viewed with horror and aversion; and in the case of Ahasuerus in the Book of Esther, we see him unable to recall the order which he had issued for a massacre of the Jews—all that he could do being to issue a counter-order, allowing the doomed people to arm in self-defence—to kill those, if they were able, who by the king's previous order were entitled to kill them. It is a remarkable fact, elsewhere noticed in the present work, that the same idea of the inviolability of the royal word exists in Persia, in a mitigated form, even in modern times.

Daniel was cast into the den of lions, the king addressing him in these emphatic words, "Thy God whom thou servest

continually, he will deliver thee." The place where these wild animals were kept was then made secure to prevent the possibility of escape, that the letter of the law might be rigidly observed—the king "sealed it with his own signet, and the signet of his lords," after which he returned to his palace in great distress of mind, and "passed the night fasting, neither were instruments of music brought before him, and his sleep went from him." The punishment here noticed of being cast into a den of lions is not previously mentioned in Scripture, and it appears to have first occurred at Babylon. It is not, perhaps, expressly stated by any ancient writer that the Babylonians were in the habit of throwing offenders to be devoured by lions kept in dens for the purpose, but there is very conclusive evidence from the discoveries of monuments by modern travellers, both at the sites of Babylon and Susa, that lions were kept to prey upon and destroy human beings, and Babylonian coins also establish the fact.

The king rose early in the morning, and hastened to the den, and "cried with a lamentable voice to Daniel, O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God whom thou servest continually able to deliver thee?" The king was thus half persuaded that a person so upright as Daniel would be miraculously preserved, nor was he mistaken. With joy he heard Daniel answer from the interior of the den, "O king, live for ever, my God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me, forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me: and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt." He was immediately taken out of the den, and "no manner of hurt was found upon him, because he believed in his God." The same irrevocable edict was now put in force against Daniel's accusers, who with their wives and children were thrown into the den of those wild animals, and instantly destroyed. Such is the substance of this remarkable transaction in the life of Daniel, in which

Darius is represented in a very peculiar manner as a prince easily persuaded by designing persons. Xenophon, says Mr Horne, "represents Cyaxares as weak and pliable, but of a cruel temper, easily managed for the most part, and ferocious in his anger. Is not this Darius?—the same Darius who allowed his nobles to make laws for him, and then repented—suffered Daniel to be cast into the lions' den, and then spent a night in lamentation for him—and at last, in strict conformity with Xenophon's description, condemned to death not only his false counsellors, but also their wives and children?"

Daniel, restored to the favour and confidence of Darius, who issued a decree that "in every dominion of his kingdom men were to tremble and fear before the God of Daniel, for he is the living God," greatly prospered, and was in the highest repute both with Darius and Cyrus. In the first year of the reign of the former as king of Babylon, and in the sixteenth of the Captivity, the Prophet was favoured with a near view of the expiration of the seventy years allotted for the captivity of Judah, in answer to a fervent and affecting prayer. The deliverance of the Jews was communicated to Daniel by the angel Gabriel in a very extraordinary revelation, but it was also intimated that the conduct and ingratitude of the Jews would cause the utter destruction of their restored city after a certain period, and connected with an event which the prophecy plainly indicates. This was the advent of the Messiah, which Daniel distinctly announced; and it is a fact worthy of observation, that it was in consequence of this prophecy concerning the *seventy weeks*, or four hundred and ninety years, that the coming of the Messiah toward the end of that period was generally expected among the Eastern nations.

Daniel had also another remarkable vision, in which were discovered to him the events to occur in Persia after the death of Cyrus—the succession of Xerxes and his celebrated expedition into Greece,

—the arrival of Alexander the Great—the overthrow of the Persian Empire—the Greek dominion—the continued wars between the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt—the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes—the destruction of that prince—and the victory and happiness of the saints. The prophecy concerning the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt, from the death of Alexander to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, is so particular and circumstantial, that it is really as perfect as any history. The prophecy is equally exact beyond the time of Antiochus, extending to remoter ages, and reaching even to the time of the resurrection and the consummation of the world. Porphyry supposes that the sequel of the prophecy was accomplished in Antiochus, and Grotius adopts this view; but most of the Christian Fathers consider Antiochus as a type of Antichrist. Some understand what remains to intimate partly the tyranny of Antiochus, and partly the great apostasy of the latter years of the Roman Empire; but others apply it wholly to the invasion and tyranny of the Romans, the subsequent corruptions of the Church, and the alterations in the Empire.

Cyrus, at the death of Darius, succeeded to the Persian throne, and as he had formed a most favourable opinion of Daniel when he first took Babylon, his regard for him was increased when he returned thither from his Syrian expedition. We may readily infer that the Prophet would exert all his influence with the king for the restoration of the Jews. To dispose Cyrus to accelerate that event Daniel laid before him the prophecies of Isaiah, in which he is mentioned by name one hundred and fifty years before he was born as one whom God had designed to be a great conqueror, king over many nations, and the restorer of his people, causing the Temple of Jerusalem to be rebuilt, and Judea to be re-occupied by the descendants of its former inhabitants. Josephus expressly assures us that Cyrus had seen and read those prophecies—a fact which

is strengthened by the intimations of Scripture, for they are evidently recited in his decree for rebuilding the Temple and restoring the city of Jerusalem. Daniel had constant access to Cyrus, and consequently he would not fail to make him acquainted with such important prophecies concerning himself.

When the Samaritans in the third year of Cyrus obstructed the rebuilding of the Temple, Daniel appears to have betaken himself to mourning and fasting three days, and he afterwards had the visions already noticed, of which the three last chapters of his Prophecy contain an account. It is supposed that he died soon afterwards, and indeed his great age must have soon terminated in his death, for if he was eighteen when he was removed to Babylon, the third year of Cyrus was the seventy-third of his captivity, and he must consequently have been ninety-one at that time. But the exact time and place of his death are not ascertained. It is no where intimated that he returned to his own country, and it is probable that he remained in Persia to be more serviceable to the Jews. His tomb has been for ages shown in Persia near the ruins of Shushan, and it has been a common tradition that he died in that city. Josephus tells us that he built a famous castellated edifice at Shushan (not at Ecbatana, as in some copies), and that in it the Persian and Parthian kings were afterwards interred. The Jewish historian calls this building *Baris*, a name similar to that which Daniel himself calls the castle or palace at Shushan in the original, and both signify an edifice built by Daniel when he was governor of the province.

The character of this distinguished person, as exhibited throughout the whole Scriptures, and wherever he is mentioned, is of the noblest description. His wisdom and piety are alike conspicuous, while he affords an example of constancy in maintaining his religious principles amid the temptations of a prosperous and affluent condition, and of a corrupt and idolatrous court, which must excite the

highest admiration. Josephus observes that he was the only one of the Prophets who enjoyed a high degree of worldly prosperity, nevertheless his life was not without its trials and annoyances by the envy and plots of jealous courtiers, but all these served the more to manifest his faith and righteousness, and eventually they tended to establish him more securely in his high station. In the vicissitudes of his life, as in the virtues he displayed, he has been thought to resemble Joseph. Like him Daniel lived in an idolatrous court, and preserved an unshaken attachment to the true religion in defiance of every difficulty. He publicly professed God's service, and predicted the judgments of Jehovah to intemperate and powerful despots. His language is well chosen and comprehensive, simple and chaste, yet occasionally strong and nervous. Sometimes he is diffuse and copious, enlarging an idea, and extending it to an uncommon pitch of grandeur, and his whole style is concise and close, but pure and regular. His Book may be divided into two parts—the *first*, containing a narrative of certain incidents with which he was personally connected; and the *second*, beginning with the seventh chapter, comprehending the visions and prophecies with which he was favoured connected with the monarchs of the world, the advent and death of the Messiah, and the destruction of the Jews as a nation. The Book of Daniel is not to be classed among the poetical compositions of the Old Testament, although parabolical imagery is sometimes employed; it rather shadows out things and events by visions and allegories, without any attempt at poetical embellishment.

Porphry, already cited, who lived towards the close of the third century of the Christian era, in the twelfth of his books against the Christian religion seems to have been the first who denied the authenticity of the Prophecy of Daniel. He alleged that all the predictions must have been written after the facts to which they refer had occurred, for they appeared to him rather a narra-

tion of events which had already taken place, the coincidences between the facts and the prophecies foretelling them being so striking. This writer, whose works are lost, with the exception of some fragments preserved by St Jerome, concluded on this principle that the Book was not written by the person whose name it bears, but by a native of Judea who lived in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Unfortunately for this statement, however, the prophecy relating to the kings of Syria and Egypt, which is said to have been written *after* the time of Antiochus, was translated into Greek, and was in the hands of the Egyptians *one hundred years before his time*—it being also well known that the Egyptians entertained no great regard either for the Jews or their religion. It ought farther to be noticed, that the prophecies which foretell the victories of Alexander the Great were shown to that conqueror when he was at Jerusalem by the Jews themselves, and procured for them some important privileges.

Many objections have been urged by several writers, who have chosen to follow the footsteps of Porphyry, against the canonical authenticity of the Book of Daniel, which are collected by Dr Lardner, who has accompanied them with the replies of St Jerome, and they are all satisfactorily answered by Bishop Chandler, in his "Vindication of the Defence of Christianity," and by Dr Samuel Chandler, in his "Vindication of the Prophecies of Daniel." Sir Isaac Newton, in his Commentary on Daniel—a work which has received the highest commendations from some, and by others treated as of little or no value—declares this Book to be the foundation of the Christian religion, and that to reject it is to reject Christianity. The Apocryphal Books attributed to this Prophet, consisting of the stories of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, and the Song of the Three Children, are extant only in the Greek, the Septuagint version being now lost. In the time of Jerome some Rabbins admitted the story of Susannah as

canonical, while others rejected it as such; Josephus, in his notices of Daniel, never alludes to the story of Susannah, and of Bel and the Dragon.

Dr Adam Clarke and several others think that Daniel was the Persian Zoroaster—a theory which they support by some very ingenious arguments. It is remarkable that among the Jews themselves it is generally maintained that Daniel was not a true Prophet, and some of them place his writings among the *Hagiographia*, as having less authority than the canonical books. They account for the fact of his not being present when his three companions were cast into the furnace, by pretending that he was absent from Babylon on an expedition into Egypt for the purpose of *stealing hogs!* They further consider his prophecies as all relating to dreams and visions, which they allege are the most imperfect modes of revelation. They also object to him that he did not reside in the Holy Land, out of which, they pretend, the spirit of prophecy was never given—that he spent his life different from the other Prophets, in the grandeur, pomp, and luxury of a royal palace, instead of solitude, poverty, and abstinence—that he was an eunuch, and therefore excluded from the congregation of the Lord. But the ancient Jews thought very differently from their modern and degenerate descendants, and he is placed by Josephus among the greatest of the Prophets. “The Jews,” says Bishop Lowth in his *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, “would refuse to Daniel even the character of a Prophet, but the arguments under which they shelter this opinion are very futile, for those points which they maintain concerning the conditions on which the gift of prophecy is imparted—the different gradations—and the discrimination between the true prophecy and mere inspiration, are all trifling and absurd, without any foundation in the nature of things, and totally destitute of Scripture authority. They add that Daniel was neither originally educated in the prophetic discipline and precepts,

nor afterwards lived conformably to the manner of the Prophets. I do not, however, comprehend how this can diminish his claim to a divine mission and inspiration; it may possibly enable us, indeed, to assign a reason for the dissimilarity between the style of Daniel and that of the other Prophets, and for its possessing so little of the diction and character of poetry, which the rest seem to have imbibed in common from the schools and discipline in which they were educated.”

DARIUS, the name or title of several Persian kings, two of whom are incidentally mentioned in the Scriptures, Darius the Mede, otherwise Cyaxares, and Darius the Persian. The former is already noticed in the preceding accounts of Cyrus and Daniel, and the latter in other parts of the present work.

DATHAN, one of the three rebellious Levites who headed the rebellion against Moses and Aaron in the Wilderness, and was punished, along with his company, in the awful manner related by the inspired historian.

DAVID, the son of Jesse, and the second king of the Jews, one of the most remarkable and illustrious men of antiquity, was born B.C. 1085. He was the youngest of the eight sons of Jesse of Bethlehem, who was descended in a right line from Judah, the son of Jacob. That princely tribe had in ancient times received great promises, and its head was, next to Joseph, the most eminent of all Jacob's sons. Of this tribe it was said, “Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, thou art gone up; he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.” Such was the final blessing of the future tribe by Jacob connected with the house and family of David; and in the same spirit of prophecy we find

that he was only required when Saul was in a state of madness, and when, we may presume, he would be unable to identify any of his attendants; and we are told that David left him when he "was refreshed and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." Nevertheless Bishop Warburton's arrangement is that which is most consistent with the order of the events, and tends to remove the difficulty of this part of the history. When Saul saw David he was astonished that a person of his apparently slender frame would be so bold as to adventure a combat with the Philistine, and he told him—"Thou art not able to go against this Philistine, to fight with him; for thou art but a youth, and he a man of war from his youth." David modestly recounted his own exploit with the lion and the bear while tending the flocks, and added—"This uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them, seeing he hath defied the armies of the living God. The Lord that delivered me out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine." His modesty in reciting his own praises to the king is conspicuous in this reply. He describes his combat with the lion in the shortest manner, and he says nothing of that with the bear except that he slew the animal, and as if this had been too much, he concludes by ascribing his deliverance to God, and not to his own prowess. He farther grounded his confidence of success on the blasphemy he had heard uttered by Goliath, and he felt assured that he would be prospered in his contest with that proud boaster, as he had formerly been with those beasts of prey which had sprung on his flocks in thesequestered pastoral retreats of the wilderness.

The noble confidence which David evinced before Saul on this occasion excited the admiration of the veteran warrior, and he received his full permission—"Go," said he, "and the Lord be with thee." The king gave him his armour, but he found it cumbersome, and put it off, resolved to make use only of his

slings. He chose five smooth stones from the bed of a rivulet, and put them in a little bag which he held in his hand. In this manner he approached the Philistine, to whom due intimation had been given that his challenge was accepted. The haughty Goliath instantly made his appearance, preceded by the man who bore his shield, and mailed in armour, with a helmet of brass upon his head. It is worthy of notice, that the narrative before us presents us with the first intimation of a suit of armour on record. Sir Samuel Meyrick states that defensive body armour had its origin in Asia, and that all the European armour, except the *plate*, which was not introduced till the fourteenth century, was borrowed from the Asiatics—the warlike tribes of Europe at first despising all protection, relying on their much courage, and considering any other defence than the shield as a mark of effeminacy.

When the gigantic Philistine recognised as his antagonist a youth, "ruddy, and of a fair countenance," unarmed and defenceless, instead of a warrior as he anticipated, he could not refrain from expressing his contempt and derision—"Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?" He "cursed David by his gods," and he then uttered the most violent expressions of indignation at this supposed outrage and insult bestowed on him by the Israelites—"Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field." We may estimate his feelings of wrath on this occasion. Was he—the pride, the boast, and the glory of the Philistine army, who had boldly defied the Hebrew army to single combat for forty days, and had made them tremble before him—to be thus at last mocked and held up to the ridicule of his own soldiers by a mere youth, unarmed, and not even a soldier?—was he to be thus treated by an enemy whom he despised, and whom he concluded was reduced to despair, while both armies stood anxious spectators of the scene, and the insult thus proclaimed both to friend and foe? Well might he

threaten to tear the inexperienced youth who now approached him in pieces, as a punishment for this unpardonable affront.

The contrast was indeed remarkable, and the Philistine could take it in no other light than as an intentional insult and personal derision. In reply to his threat, David addressed him in a manner which would increase his indignation—"Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand, and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee, and I will give the carcases of the host of the Philistines this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the earth, that all the earth may know there is a God in Israel. And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear, for the battle is the Lord's, and he will give you into our hands." In this speech, which intimates that the language of the Hebrews was well understood by the Philistines, whose language was indeed a dialect of it, David makes no rash boastings and confident assurances of victory, but praised the Divine Omnipotence, by whose assistance alone he could achieve a triumph. It was zeal for God and his country which induced him to accept the challenge of Goliath, and in the strength of Him with whose Spirit he was inspired, he considered his gigantic enemy as less formidable than the lion and the bear which had fallen by his hand. He knew that by the general law and sentence of God the Philistines were doomed to destruction, and that their champion more particularly deserved his fate for the revilings and reproaches he had uttered against Jehovah and his people. He entered the lists as one who fought under the banners of the God of Israel, and appeared in vindication of His honour and glory. He truly said that "the battle was the Lord's."

The Philistine now hastened to approach David, whom he had resolved to

dispatch with a blow, but while he was so doing, the young Hebrew champion placed one of the round stones he had selected from the channel of the rivulet in his sling, and gave him a mortal wound in the forehead, which laid him dead in a moment. He immediately ran towards the prostrate warrior, leaped on his vast body, and cut off his head with his own sword, for we are expressly told that "there was no sword in the hand of David." A loud shout rent the air, raised by the exulting Hebrews, while the astonished Philistines immediately fled, leaving all their tents, and were pursued with great slaughter. Saul, in admiration of the heroic act of David, turned to Abner, his principal commander, and asked whose son he was, but that officer replied that he could not tell. He was ordered to make inquiry, and coming up to David as he was returning from the slaughter of the Philistine, Abner brought him into the presence of Saul. David informed the king who he was, and mentioned the residence of his father. On this occasion he acquired the friendship of Jonathan, Saul's eldest son, which terminated only with the death of that amiable and unfortunate prince—a friendship of which there are few examples on record in the history of any individuals in any age, so pure, so disinterested, so mutual, and so honourable to both parties. Jonathan conferred on David the highest mark of consideration which an Oriental king or prince can bestow. He "stripped himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David, and his garments, even to his sword, and to his bow, and to his girdle." It has been the Eastern custom, from the most ancient times to the present day, of doing persons the highest honour, by the king or prince conferring on them a dress or robe worn by himself, of which we have repeated intimations not only in the Scriptures, but in ordinary history; and, as in the present case, when the king's son takes his own robes and weapons immediately from his person and bestows them on another, it is the highest mark of honour which

can be given, as it is regarded not only as an indication of favour, but of attachment, of which Oriental princes are in general very cautious to give demonstrations, however profuse they may be in bestowing marks of consideration.

The armour and arms of Goliath were preserved, as a memorial of the glory of the Israelites on this occasion. The inspired historian informs us that David carried them first to his own tent, but it appears that they were afterwards deposited in a sacred place, for we read that when David, on a subsequent occasion, asked the high priest Abimelech if he could furnish him with a sword or a spear, he was answered, "The sword of Goliath is here wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod, if thou wilt take that, take it;" and it was immediately delivered to him. Josephus tells us that the sword of the gigantic Philistine was consecrated to God by David himself, who also carried Goliath's head to Jerusalem, when he made choice of that city as the capital of his kingdom.

It was one of the remarkable arrangements of Divine Providence that the future king of the Israelites should be introduced to them when their whole army was assembled, and on an occasion which would not soon be forgotten. David had indeed been anointed to succeed Saul, but no one knew anything of that transaction except himself, his father's family, and the Prophet Samuel, but by this act of heroism he became famous throughout the whole nation. Saul retained David in his service, and allowed him to return no more to his pastoral avocations. He was also promoted to a high command in the Hebrew army, where he became extremely popular "in the sight of all the people, and in the sight of Saul's servants." But while this act of heroism opened to David a new career, in which he was soon to distinguish himself as an able and successful general—all preparatory to his obtaining the throne, it also exposed him to a series of persecutions and distresses from the king, in whose service he had conducted himself with so

much honour, though these persecutions, on the other hand, tended to perfect and confirm his devoted loyalty to Jehovah, the invisible and omnipotent King of Israel. Saul was at first mortified to hear that ten times more glory was ascribed to the vanquisher of Goliath than to himself. Wherever the king proceeded, after the defeat of the Philistines, the very "women came out of all cities of Israel, singing, and dancing with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music; and the women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands." This gave great offence to the king, and excited a violent jealousy. He even began to suspect that David was the very man to whom the crown was to be transferred, and he determined to put this now hated rival out of the way. He still retained too much feeling of honour to be willingly known as a murderer, but in one of his fits of passion he levelled twice, as if by accident, a javelin at David, who both times avoided the intended blow.

Saul after this appears to have desisted from any farther attempts at direct murder, and resolved on other methods of destroying David. He gave him several employments, to remove him from the court, but these only served to render David's merits more conspicuous, and to increase his popularity with the nation. We are told that "all Israel and Judah loved David, because he went out and came in before them;" namely, he *went out* on the expeditions to which Saul appointed him, and *came in* from them with success *before the people*, who were attentive observers of his prudent and upright conduct. By repeated promises of marriage with his eldest daughter Merab—an honour to which David listened with great diffidence and modesty—he induced him to undertake various hazardous enterprises in fighting what he called "the Lord's battles," in the hope that he might fall in some of his encounters with the Philistines. But Saul was disappointed in these expectations;

yet, although he gave his eldest daughter to Adriel, he did not relinquish his design of marrying him to another of his daughters. Michal, a younger sister of Merab, entertained a violent attachment to David, the fact of which was communicated to Saul. He was pleased with the intelligence, and he said, "I will give him her, that she may be a snare to him, and that the hand of the Philistines may be against him." Thus resolved, he assumed the mask of hypocrisy to David. He told him that he still designed to make him his son-in-law, and he ordered his servants to flatter him on the subject, and to say to him, "Behold, the king hath delight in thee, and all his servants love thee; now, therefore, be the king's son-in-law." From the tone of entreaty here assumed it is evident that the affection between Saul's daughter and David was not mutual, but the latter prudently abstained from offering any farther observation than simply alluding to his circumstances—it being customary among the Hebrews to endow the wife, and to receive nothing with her. He said to those insidious flatterers, "Seemeth it to you a light thing to be a king's son-in-law, seeing that I am a poor man, and lightly esteemed?" This saying was repeated to Saul, who instructed his officers to inform David that he did not want any other dowry than the fulfilment of certain conditions he proposed in a new enterprise against the Philistines, in which, from its dangerous nature, he strongly calculated that the object of his aversion would be slain. David willingly consented to the terms, but instead of falling beneath the swords of the Philistines, he came off victorious in this expedition also, and acquired new glory. Saul could not consistently refuse to fulfil his promise, and he gave Michal in marriage to David. Thus we see the workings of Divine Providence all in operation to accomplish the great object in view, not miraculously or suddenly, but by apparently human agency, and by a train of fortunate yet not very extraordinary circumstances. David was

destined to be king; he was already well known to the Israelites; and an alliance with the reigning family placed him in a position which would greatly facilitate his advancement to the throne, and tend to allay those factions which might otherwise oppose his claims, or deny the validity of his appointment.

Saul was mortified to find that the alliance with his family made David still more popular and important with the people. The jealousy of the unhappy monarch was now increased, and he at length determined to set at defiance every restraint, and destroy his son-in-law. He even made no secret of his intentions, for "he spoke to Jonathan, and to all his servants, that they should kill David." But Jonathan spurned the odious proposal, and showed himself not only an attached friend, but a son sincerely desirous to preserve his father's honour. He advised David to conceal himself for a little time, while he would seek an interview with his father, and faithfully relate what might be the result. Jonathan sought the king, and in a mild tone reminded him of the services of David, particularly how he "slew the Philistine," when "the Lord wrought a great salvation for all Israel," and the king himself "saw it, and did rejoice." In the simplicity of Jonathan's plain and short intercession we perceive all the strength of reasoning, combined with the skill and delicacy of address, which could possibly be crowded into so few words. He knew that to dwell particularly on David's eminent and acknowledged merits would only inflame his father's enmity, and, therefore, though he mentioned his friend's services in general, he insisted only on one exploit with which Saul himself had some concern, well aware that when he recalled to his father's mind the greatness and generosity of the reward offered—splendid honours, and his own daughter in marriage—he would succeed in subduing his jealous resentment. He was for the time successful. Saul seemed convinced by the force of his son's observations, and declared, "As

the Lord liveth, he shall not be slain." Jonathan "brought David to Saul, and he was in his presence as in times past."

But this reconciliation was of no long continuance. A war again commenced with the Philistines, and the command of the army was given to David, who gained a complete victory, and returned in triumph. This induced Saul to resume his resolution, and on a particular occasion, when in a fit of melancholy, he hurled a javelin with all his strength at David, who, though intent on his music, avoided the stroke. It was now time to leave Saul's court, and he instantly retired to his own residence. Persons were ordered to watch him, and to put him to death whenever he appeared in the morning. His wife Michal informed him of his danger, and by her artifice he made his escape with great difficulty. We are informed that she let him "down through a window," and thus contrived to elude the vigilance of those ordered to kill him.

Michal's information was well founded respecting her father's purpose to kill David. This is sufficiently intimated by what she immediately connected. She took an image, in the original a *teraphim*, and "laid it on the bed, and put a pillow of goat's hair for his bolster, and covered it with a cloth; and when Saul sent messengers to take David, she said, He is sick." Saul, however, was resolved to hazard no delay, and he probably thought that it was advantageous to dispatch his rival when he could make no resistance. He ordered David to be brought before him in his bed, and sent persons to carry him, who soon discovered the deception practised upon them. Saul inveighed against his daughter Michal for her conduct, but she excused herself by alleging that her husband threatened to kill her if she did not assist in enabling him to escape. The command of Saul—*Bring him up to me in the bed*—here reminds us that the beds then commonly in use were probably, as now, merely a padded quilt, doubled for a mattress, and another, single, for a covering, and there

cannot be a more convenient way of transporting a sick person than to wrap him up in his bed and carry him away. In Western Asia this is usually the manner in which sick persons are conveyed from one place to another when it is necessary to remove them.

David fled to Naioth in Ramah, where the Prophet Samuel then resided, to whom he communicated all that had been done to him by Saul. That unhappy king, whose implacable hatred to David had eradicated all respect and reverence for Samuel, under whose protection David now was—the college of the prophets being a sanctuary to all who fled to it, he sent messengers to apprehend the fugitive, and at last proceeded thither himself, but David was rescued by the manifest intervention of Providence. Not only the messengers, but even Saul himself, *prophesied*, and this was the origin of a common proverb—"Is Saul also among the Prophets?" The general opinion of interpreters respecting this *prophesying* is, that Saul sang psalms and hymns of thanksgiving and praise, which he was reluctantly compelled to do, to teach him the vanity of his designs against David, and to show that in them he fought against God.

A short time after these transactions David had an interview with Jonathan, when they renewed their bond of friendship in the most affectionate manner, and a scheme was concerted by which the latter was to give his friend notice of his father's feelings towards him. As the whole of this, and the results of it, are very minutely narrated by the inspired historian (1 Sam. xx.), it is unnecessary to enter into the details. It may be simply observed, in reference to sundry expressions in this chapter (1 Sam. xx. 14, 15) and in other passages, that Jonathan was well aware of the Divine appointment of David to succeed his father in the kingdom of Israel. Although himself thus passed over, he cheerfully acquiesced in the determination, and his steady affection and friendship, under these circumstances, for the man by

whom he had been superseded, manifests the highest generosity of character, of which David appears to have been duly sensible.

After taking an affectionate leave of Jonathan, who had incurred the bitter resentment of his father for his friendship with David, the latter retired to Nob, where Ahimelech the high priest dwelt, from whom he obtained some of the hallowed bread of the tabernacle, and the sword of Goliath, which had been preserved behind the ephod, "wrapped in a cloth." Here David met Doeg the Edomite, the chief herdsman of Saul's flocks, and consequently a proselyte to the Jewish religion, though some of the Rabbins think that he is called an Edomite merely because he had resided in Edom. But the more Saul endeavoured to procure David's death, and thus to secure the crown to his own family, the more he directed the eyes of the Israelites towards his rival, and by these very exertions he, by a strange infatuation, endangered the succession of his own son. David left the high priest, and sought the protection of Achish, king of Gath, by whom he appears to have been well received; but the Philistine nobles excited their king's suspicions, and in order to escape their snares he feigned himself mad. Having thus saved himself by exciting the superstitious alarms of the Philistines, he was allowed to leave Gath, and the cave of Adullam in the tribe of Judah concealed him for some time. But David soon found that this cave might be made a prison by his enemies, or that he could be easily subdued in it; and, besides, he was now joined by four hundred malecontents with their families. We are told that "every one that was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him, and he became a captain over them." The mode of life at this time adopted by David was precisely that followed by Jephthah when his reputation brought around him men of similar character; and it is so far from being considered dishonourable in the

East, that it is reckoned as fair as any class of military operations. On this occasion, when David first appears as an independent leader, it is necessary to make a few observations which will explain his peculiar situation in some subsequent transactions during the life of Saul. It is first of all, therefore, necessary to presume, that in the East, as in European countries—and even in our own some centuries ago, when a warrior had acquired a reputation for courage and ability, it was usual for young men to place themselves under him, forming a retinue of volunteers, who felt themselves bound to do honour to their chief by their exploits, and to defend him with their lives. The chief, on the other hand, was bound to support them, and he also from time to time made them many valuable presents. A kind of military robbery consequently became necessary, and predatory excursions were not accounted disreputable when carried on beyond the limits of their own tribe or nation. They also levied contributions, chiefly of corn and cattle, from the inhabitants of the district protected by their valour, and these subsidies furnished the troops with provisions. We have an instance of this when David sent some of his men to Carmel to ask the rich Nabal for a supply of provisions, alleging, as the reason for the demand, the safety which Nabal's shepherds had enjoyed while his troops were in that neighbourhood.

David was also joined by his parents and relatives, who had become suspected by Saul, and he now found it necessary to provide for their safety. He therefore sent a deputation to the king of Moab, requesting protection for his "father and mother," until he knew "what God would do for him." This is the last time David's parents are mentioned. The Jews think that his brothers were included, and that the king of Moab put to death the whole family except one brother, who was preserved by Nahash, king of the Ammonites; for which kind act they allege that David afterwards ex-

pressed his gratitude. His request was granted, and his relatives remained under the protection of the king of Moab during David's residence in Mizpeh in that country.

David, by the advice of the Prophet Gad, left Moab, and came to the Forest of Hareth in the territory of Judah—a place not very far from Keilah. When Saul heard that his rival had returned, and that "men were with him," he convened his officers, and severely reproved them for not informing him that his son Jonathan had "made a league with the son of Jesse," or "showing him that his son had stirred up his servant against him to lie in wait." If this complaint of Saul had been just he would have deserved commiseration, but there was no ground for the charge, except the consciousness of deserving what he dreaded. A most injurious imputation has, moreover, been cast on David for his behaviour on this occasion, as if he had attempted to raise a rebellion against his sovereign; but his whole conduct shows that he never opposed or disturbed the government of Saul, or entered into a conspiracy to dethrone him. David acted, in short, in the manner in which he did, by the extraordinary proceedings of the king himself, who unjustly persecuted, by his envious jealousy, an individual who had rendered him many great and important services.

The calumny of Doeg the Edomite—who had been present at Nob when David received the shew-bread and the sword of Goliath from Ahimelech the high priest—caused Saul, who found a willing instrument in the same Doeg, to massacre eighty-five priests, including Ahimelech, and to ravage Nob the sacerdotal city. Abiathar, one of the murdered priest's sons, escaped and fled to David, whom he informed of the melancholy event. The fugitive replied, in the language of the deepest sympathy at the intelligence, "I knew it that day when Doeg the Edomite was there, that he would surely tell Saul: I have occasioned the death of all the persons of thy

father's house. Abide thou with me, fear not, for he that seeketh my life seeketh thy life: but with me thou shalt be safe." The accession of Abiathar secured to David the sacred lot, with which he had fled to save his own life; and the massacre of the priests, and of the inhabitants of Nob, who were the Gibeonite servants of the sacred tabernacle, deprived Saul of the affection of all the well-disposed Hebrews. After this it appears that many influential men, even of Saul's paternal tribe of Benjamin, joined the party of David.

While the future king of Israel concealed himself in the Forest of Hareth, his followers had increased to six hundred, who were trained to be brave and adventurous warriors. With them he rescued the frontier fortress of Keilah from the siege of the Philistines, but the ungrateful citizens would have betrayed him for fear of Saul, if he had not been duly warned of their treachery by the sacred lot. He withdrew to the Wilderness of Ziph, where he received a consolatory visit from Jonathan, and their bond of friendship was renewed. The residence of David and his followers in this solitary retreat was soon made known to Saul by the inhabitants of the Desert, who expressed the utmost gratitude to the Nomades for their friendly information. He engaged them to commence a keen pursuit after David, who had retired to the Wilderness of Maon, promising to come to their assistance, and to take advantage of their intelligence. The outlaw would have probably fallen into the hands of Saul at this time, as they were now only separated from each other by a single mountain, if Divine Providence had not interfered, and called back the king by a report of a Philistine incursion.

From the Wilderness of Maon we find David retiring to the strongholds of Engedi, but neither those lofty, rough, and rocky mountains, nor the remote frontiers of the great sandy desert of Arabia Petræa, were secure retreats from the snares and vigilance of Saul, who

scoured those mountains with three thousand men, and afterwards penetrated into the Desert with the same number, to capture his fugitive son-in-law. It is remarkable that in both of those enterprises Saul fell into David's power, and if the latter had not been actuated by the highest sense of religious duty, loyalty, and honour, he might have slain his persecutor. When among the mountains of Engedi, Saul composed himself to sleep, unattended, in the same cave where David and a company of his followers were concealed in its recesses. They saw the king enter, and stretch himself in a profound slumber, and they urged David to take advantage of his unguarded situation. Their leader cut off the skirt of Saul's robe, but he immediately repented even of this harmless action, and repressed the violent inclinations of his followers, by solemnly declaring, "The Lord forbid that I should do this thing unto my master, the Lord's anointed, to stretch forth mine hand against him, seeing he is the anointed of the Lord." Here, says Dr Chandler, was a "noble instance of David's moderation and forbearance, as well as greatness and generosity of mind. The feelings which restrained him are worthy of a brave and generous man—a man of honour, religion, and virtue. He durst not stretch forth his hand against his *master, the Lord's anointed*. Under this sacred character he forgot that Saul was his implacable enemy, and instantly sacrificed his resentment to his conscience and duty." To these observations we may add, that to David a divinely appointed king as Saul was, though his enemy, was a sacred person, and to lay violent hands on him, and to open a way to the throne by regicide, was a crime of the most heinous nature, which he justly abhorred. David had been promised the kingdom, but his religious principles and his confidence in God taught him to wait for it in the ordinary course of that Providence which overrules and superintends all things. He knew, as he expresses in one of his Psalms, that the violent man cannot

prosper, and that the God of his fathers, who had ordained him to be king over Israel, would "bring forth his righteousness as the light, and his judgment as the noon-day."

Saul was permitted to rest himself undisturbed, and in like manner to leave the cave. He had proceeded no great distance when he heard a voice exclaiming, "My lord the king." He turned, and to his amazement he saw David standing at the entrance of the cave, who rendered him the homage due to him as the sovereign—he "stooped with his face to the earth, and bowed himself." David immediately addressed an expostulatory speech to the king, and asked him why he had allowed himself to be so long deceived by the reports of those who asserted that he (David) sought his life. "Behold," he said, "this day thine eyes have seen how that the Lord had delivered thee to-day into mine hand in the cave; and some bade me kill thee, but mine eye spared thee, and I said, I will not put forth mine hand against my lord, for he is the Lord's anointed. Moreover, my father, see, yea, see the skirt of thy robe in my hand: for in that I cut off the skirt of thy robe and killed thee not, know thou and see that there is neither evil nor transgression in mine hand, and I have not sinned against thee; yet thou huntest my soul to take it. The Lord judge between me and thee, and the Lord avenge me of thee: but mine hand shall not be upon thee. As saith the proverb of the ancients, Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked: but mine hand shall not be upon thee. After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea. The Lord, therefore, be judge, and judge between me and thee, and see, and plead my cause, and deliver me out of thine hand." David, in the conclusion of his speech, contrasts his circumstances with the power of the king of Israel. Similar phrases are still employed by the Orientals when they wish to express their own lowliness, or their detestation. As it respects the dog, this

animal is noticed in both senses in the Scriptures. When Goliath felt his dignity insulted he exclaimed, "Am I a dog?" Abner, when his conduct was questioned, said, "Am I a dog's head?" And Jonathan's son, affected by the kindness of David, said, "What is thy servant, that thou shouldest look upon such a dead dog as I am?" St Paul applies the epithet to persons of bad principles and sensual habits—"Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers;" and in the Apocalypse—"Without are dogs, and sorcerers," &c. Even amongst ourselves, though we estimate this useful animal in a manner different from the Orientals, the same contemptuous opinion of its character, and the application of its name, continues to prevail.

When David concluded his address, Saul, notwithstanding his long cherished hatred, could not withstand the touching appeal. His former generosity returned; he melted and sunk under it; he "lifted up his voice and wept," and with his tears acknowledged David's innocence and his own folly. "Is this thy voice," he exclaimed, "my son David?" He admitted the truth of every observation, and prayed to God to reward the very person whom he was at that moment pursuing to destruction. "I know well," he said, "that thou shalt surely be king, and that the kingdom of Israel shall be established in thine hand. Swear, therefore, unto me by the Lord that thou wilt not cut off my seed after me, and that thou wilt not destroy my name out of my father's house." David did as Saul requested him, and they separated, the former betaking himself to his strongholds in the mountains, and the latter returning to his family. "David," says Dr Chandler, "generously took the oath, and honourably and religiously performed it. The whole address of Saul to David on this occasion was the natural effect of the various thoughts and passions which then agitated his breast. The full conviction he had of David's innocence, the proof now given him of the greatness of his temper, some remains of generosity in his

own breast, the consciousness of the falsehood of his own suspicions, and of his his own injurious and ungrateful conduct, the recollection of David's appointment to succeed him, the vanity of opposing the orders of God, the tender concern he had for the fate of his family under David's reign—all these considerations, and the various passions arising from them, crowding in his mind, and uniting their force, drew forth an acknowledgment and a request which nothing else could have extorted from him."

In the transaction of David's life which follows this instance of his magnanimity, we have a striking proof of the impartiality of the sacred historians, who record the failings, the imperfections, and the criminal actions of their distinguished men, without any attempt at glossing or concealment, thus verifying the admirable and conclusive observation of St Paul, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and that while one part of it is profitable for "doctrine," another for "reproof," and another for "correction," it is also comprehensively adapted for "instruction in righteousness." This was the affair of Nabal, against whom David's vindictive resolution cannot be justified, as he himself soon saw and candidly acknowledged. We are told that he removed to the Wilderness of Paran, where, being reduced to distress for want of provisions, he sent to a wealthy inhabitant of Carmel, named Nabal, for supplies. This Carmel was situated in the tribe of Judah, and must therefore be distinguished from the celebrated Mount Carmel on the Mediterranean. The district extended southward till it met the desert territory unappropriated by individuals, which formed the northern part of the Desert of Paran, where David remained with his men. From the nature and situation of his possessions it appears that Nabal sent his flock southward into the Desert for pasture, where his shepherds came in contact with David, who not only directed his men not to rob the flocks, as probably was, as it still is, usual for persons in their

circumstances to do, and to which there was great temptation, but by his presence he protected them from depredations by the Nomade tribes who roamed through those regions unrestrained, and existed by pillage and plunder. Such protection, under these circumstances, is generally so highly valued, that a suitable present is certain to follow, which in most instances is bestowed cheerfully and liberally by the proprietors of the flocks. David's demand, though he had no absolute right to Nabal's goods, nor any lawful authority to punish him for his incivility, was at least fair and reasonable, and his messengers requested in a respectful manner—intimating the protection which David had afforded Nabal's shepherds—what most chiefs would have in no very gentle terms demanded as a right. While Nabal was shearing his sheep, David's messengers arrived and made known their necessities, but instead of even being civilly refused, the irritable Nabal asked in a very contemptuous manner who was David, and who was the son of Jesse, reproaching him with having shamefully rebelled against his sovereign, and declaring that he would not give his bread, and his water, and the flesh which he had killed for his shearers, to men of whom he knew nothing. Enraged at this answer, David armed four hundred of his followers, and put himself at their head, resolved not to suffer any one of Nabal's household to escape the edge of the sword. He even bound himself by an oath to commit this most wanton and wicked action, and actually prepared to march for that purpose, when Abigail, the beautiful wife of Nabal, who had been informed of the whole matter by one of her husband's servants, appeared with suitable presents unknown to him:—she “took two hundred loaves, and two bottles (skins or leather bags) of wine, and five sheep ready dressed, and five measures of parched corn, and an hundred clusters of raisins, and two hundred cakes of figs,” and with this liberal supply of provisions she appeared before David, who was vowing deadly vengeance

against her husband. But her beauty and her complimentary address disarmed the Hebrew warrior of his resentiment; she besought him to excuse the madness of her husband, whom she designated “a man of Belial,” for his wilful obstinacy, “for as his name is,” said she, “so is he; Nabal is his name, and folly is with him,” representing him as offending rather out of folly than from malice—*Nabal* signifying a *fool* in Hebrew. The address of Abigail was so pleasing to David that he readily listened to her request, saying, “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who sent thee this day to meet me; and blessed be thy advice, and blessed be thou, who hast kept me this day from coming to shed blood, and from avenging myself with mine own hand.—Go up in peace to thine house; see, I have hearkened to thy voice, and have accepted thy person.” By the prudent conduct of Abigail was David thus prevented from committing a most criminal and unjustifiable action. Nabal, who is described as a very intemperate individual in addition to his irritable temper, soon afterwards died, and David married his widow. He also about this time married Ahinoam of Jezreel, having been deprived of his wife Michal by Saul, who gave his daughter to Phalti of Gallim.

The generous conduct of David made no lasting impression on Saul. He received information that his rival was at Hachilah in the Wilderness of Ziph, on the confines of the great desert of Arabia Petræa, and he put himself at the head of three thousand men once more to pursue his son-in-law. David obtained due notice from his spies of Saul's proceedings. It appears that the king had encamped according to the Oriental custom, which, whether nomade, travelling, or military, is always done in a circular form—the chief, leader, or king, always being in the centre, and his followers dispersed round him; though, under the ordinary circumstances of a camp, the chief among some tribes often foregoes this distinction for the sake of the duties of hospitality, which require him to have his tent the nearest

to that direction from which strangers usually arrive. It is not clear that Saul's party had tents in this expedition against David, but the same order is observed even when a party is without tents. According to this arrangement, when David took a survey of Saul's encampment, he readily distinguished the position which the king occupied with Abner his commander, and could single it out even by night. The soldiers of Saul, fatigued with their exertions and marches, sunk in repose around their king, "because a deep sleep from the Lord was fallen upon them." David observed the careless security of his pursuers, and he said to Abimelech the Hittite, and to Abishai the brother of Joab, "Who will go down with me to Saul in the camp?" Abishai instantly offered, and it is probable that David required only one of them to attend him. They advanced cautiously during the night, and found all the party asleep—Saul in the centre—his spear stuck in the ground at his head. When they discovered the condition of Saul and his party, Abishai said to David, "God hath delivered thine enemy into thine hand this day; now, therefore, let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear, even to the earth at once, and I will not smite him the second time." But David immediately replied, "Destroy him not, for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed and be guiltless?" He also added—"As the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him, or his day shall come to die, or he shall descend into battle and perish. The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth mine hand against the Lord's anointed, but, I pray thee, take thou now the spear that is at his head, and the cruse of water, and let us go"—it being usual for persons in the East, when sleeping at night, and particularly in the open air, to have a small vessel of water at their head, or within reach, lest it should be wanted during the night, or early in the morning. This was done, and the two heroes departed, not one of Saul's party having observed them.

In the morning, when the whole encampment was awake, David stationed himself upon an eminence at a convenient distance, and called to Abner, who asked, "Who art thou that criest to the king?" David replied in an able strain of ironical reproach—"Art not thou a valiant man? and who is like to thee in Israel? wherefore then hast thou not kept thy lord the king? for there came one of the people in to destroy thy lord the king. This thing is not good that thou hast done. As the Lord liveth ye are worthy to die, because ye have not kept your master, the Lord's anointed. And now see where the king's spear is, and the cruse of water that was at his head." While David was reproaching Abner for his neglect, Saul recognised the speaker, and called out—"Is this thy voice, my son David?" He saw at once this second instance of magnanimity on the part of his rival, of which the possession of the spear and the cruse gave too certain indications, and again his conscience reproached him for his relentless and unjustifiable conduct. David replied, "It is my voice, my lord, O king. Wherefore doth my lord thus pursue after his servant, for what have I done, or what evil is in mine hand?" He then began a defence of himself, in which he again remonstrated with Saul for persisting in the unwarranted and unprovoked persecution of one of the humblest of his servants. The king acknowledged the folly of his proceedings:—"I have sinned," he said; "return, my son David, for I will no more do thee harm, because my soul was precious in thine eyes this day; behold, I have played the fool, and have erred exceedingly." The interview terminated amicably with a prayer or benediction from Saul, which, notwithstanding his relentless conduct, excited compassion for his unhappy situation:—"Blessed be thou, my son David: thou shalt both do great things, and also shalt still prevail." Thus forgiving and forgiven, the contending rivals separated—"David went on his way, and Saul returned to his place."

This apparent reconciliation did not lessen David's care for his own security. Having been several times betrayed to Saul, he retired with his followers to Gath, where they were kindly received by the king, named Achish, probably the successor of that Achish who reigned when he first went to Gath. His motives for retiring into exile are different from those which he assigned on the previous occasion. He said in his heart—"I shall now perish one day by the hand of Saul; there is nothing better for me than that I should speedily escape into the land of the Philistines, and Saul shall despair of me to seek me in any coast of Israel, so shall I escape out of his hand." David's future prospects, and the enmity of Saul, might incline the king of Gath to treat with kindness the great enemy of the Philistines, and some even think that he voluntarily offered him a refuge in his dominions; but it is clear, from the farther development of the narrative, that the Philistine prince was guided chiefly by reasons of policy. On the other hand, David was right in his conjecture respecting Saul, who "sought no more for him" when he was told that he had fled to Gath.

The fugitive Hebrews under the command of David amounted to six hundred, "every man with his household, even David with his two wives, Ahinoam the Jezreelitess, and Abigail the Carmelitess, Nabal's wife." For obvious reasons David was anxious to reside in a place distant from Gath, either wishing to be less under observation and restraint, or to procure more suitable accommodation for his followers. Having preferred his request to Achish, that "some town in the country" should be allotted to him for his residence, he received the little town of Ziklag, a considerable distance to the south of Gath. Here he resided one year and four months, until the death of Saul, during which time he engaged in excursions against the ancient predatory enemies of the Hebrews—the Amalekites, the Geshurites, and the Gezrites, who roved about in Arabia Petraea as far

as Pelusium, and on the southern frontier of the territory of Judah. In all these excursions David not only obtained great spoils, but put every person to the sword, and when Achish inquired against whom he fought, he replied, "Against the south of Judah, and against the south of the Jerahmeelites, and against the south of the Kenites"—Jerahmeel, who gave his name to this branch of the tribe, being the great-grandson of Judah. Achish believed David's statement that he was literally acting against his own tribe, and expressed himself gratified at the circumstance:—"He hath made his people Israel utterly to abhor him; therefore he shall be my servant for ever."

While thus engaged, and secure from the attempts of Saul, the Philistines took the field in the last war against that unfortunate monarch, and David was summoned by Achish to assist him. "Know thou assuredly," he said to David, "that thou shalt go out with me to battle, thou and thy men." This placed the fugitive Hebrews in a very peculiar situation, and their leader was driven to the alternative of either assisting the Philistines against his own countrymen, or of appearing ungrateful to his benefactor. He nevertheless expressed his willingness to co-operate with the Philistines. "Surely," he said to Achish, "thou shalt know what thy servant can do." This reply pleased the king, and he expressed the strongest confidence in David's sincerity:—"Therefore will I make thee keeper of mine head for ever"—intimating that he would make his Hebrew ally the commander of his body guard, which is a station of great trust and special honour at Oriental courts. David accordingly joined his forces to the Philistine army, but the jealousy of the heads of the other Philistine states extricated him from the difficulty, and he was dismissed from the expedition. It was feared that in the heat of the battle the Hebrews under David would fall on the Philistines to make their peace with Saul. Achish was compelled to agree to the remonstrances of the allied Philistine chiefs. He sum-

moned David, and said, "Surely as the Lord liveth thou hast been upright, and thy going out and coming in with me in the host is good in my sight; for I have not found evil in thee since the day of thy coming in unto me unto this day; nevertheless the lords favour thee not. Therefore now return, and go in peace, that thou displease not the lords of the Philistines." David, however, felt that his honour was suspected, although Achish had stated that he reposed the utmost confidence in him. "But what have I done," he demanded, "and what hast thou found in thy servant so long as I have been with thee unto this day, that I may not go fight against the enemies of my lord the king?" This intimates that he had really resolved to contribute with all his might to the victory of the uncircumcised Philistines over his own countrymen; but it must also be allowed that the answer was prudent, and such as became the circumstances in which he was placed. Achish repeated his own opinion of his fidelity, but declared that he could not act against the resolution of his allies. David was probably gratified at being released from his disagreeable situation, and withdrew. When he returned to Ziklag, he found that the Amalekites, Geshurites, and Gezrites, had revenged themselves for his inroads on them by plundering that town, and laying it in ashes during his absence. The predatory hordes had also carried off the wives and families of his men, including his own two wives—a circumstance which so greatly exasperated his followers that they threatened to stone him as the cause of their misfortunes. But David, by consulting the ephod, was divinely assured that if he pursued his enemies he would overtake them. He put himself at the head of four hundred men, "for two hundred abode behind who were so faint that they could not go over the brook Besor," and determined to recover the captives. While in the pursuit he found "a young man of Egypt, servant to an Amalekite," lying faint and exhausted in a field. This Egyptian had probably been

taken prisoner by the Amalekites in one of their incursions into the Egyptian territory, and retained as a slave. On this occasion he had become sick, and had been left by his master—as is sometimes the case in the East—to perish, in the rapid march of the Amalekites with their captives and booty. He gave David the necessary information respecting the route of the enemy, by which he was enabled soon to overtake the depredators. He recaptured all they had taken, and gained in addition considerable spoils, part of which he sent as presents to all those places the inhabitants of which favoured his cause.

In this war with the Philistines Saul was so disheartened, that he applied for assistance even to those enchantresses whom he had formerly threatened with death. The battle, afterwards fought in the plain of Jezreel, proved most disastrous to the Hebrews, and Saul, that he might not fall into the hands of his enemies, slew himself, after a reign of forty years, B.C. 1056. Three of his sons, one of whom was Jonathan, were left dead on the field, and Abner, his general, drew off the remains of his army to the other side of the Jordan, where he caused Ishbosheth, the youngest son of Saul, to be proclaimed king. Meanwhile David, on the third day after his return from the pursuit of the Amalekites, was informed of the defeat of the Israelites, and of the death of Saul and his sons, by a person from the camp who called himself an Amalekite, and who pretended that he had slain the king at his own special request—bringing to him the royal insignia as a proof of the fact. This Amalekite was evidently aware of David's situation with reference to the crown, and probably expected a munificent reward for thus announcing the death of his rival and persecutor. But the intelligence was received with the greatest grief by David and his followers; the Amalekite was executed as a regicide; and the fate of Saul and Jonathan was lamented in a beautiful and affecting elegy, the language of which those only can impute to

hypocrisy who are themselves incapable of such magnanimity, and are determined to forget that David, during the life of his persecutor, always respected him as a king appointed by God, and spared him when he had him completely in his power. "How are the mighty fallen!" was his pathetic exclamation. "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph." With Jonathan the poem begins, and with that ardent and devoted friend it ends.—"I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan. very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women."—"In the encomiums passed respectively on Saul and Jonathan," observes Dr Chandler, "there is nothing but what became the character of both, and suited the situation of him that gave them. He celebrates Saul for his victories, and sheds a tear over him for his defeat, and the indignities offered to him after his death, but without a single reflection on his past injustice and cruelty towards himself; and as to Jonathan, his friend, the sorrow he expresses for him is most tender and pathetic. The lamentation over the slain heroes of Israel in the beginning, and several times repeated—the manner in which he expresses his grief at the thought of the defeat being published among the Philistines—his passionately wishing that neither dews nor rains might ever fall on the mountains of Gilboa, and the fields surrounding them—his recounting the past victories of Saul and Jonathan, who never drew a bow, or brandished a sword, without its proving fatal to their enemies, to set forth in a more lively manner the reverse of their condition—his honourable mention of their mutual affection while they lived, and their dying bravely together in the field of battle—his exclamation to the daughters of Israel to mourn over Saul—his celebration of the mutual tender friendship between himself and Jonathan—in a word, his whole elegy, both in sentiment and

expression, hath all the charms with which the spirit of poetry can adorn it, shows the richness of David's genius, and will be a monument to his praise throughout all generations."

Immediately after this, we find David by the Divine direction proceeding from Ziklag to Hebron in Judah, where he was acknowledged king by the rulers of that tribe, who acted independently for themselves, and who do not appear to have consulted the other eleven tribes. Those tribes did homage to Ishbosheth, and Abner, who was continued in the command of the army, marched at the head of a considerable force to compel the tribe of Judah to obedience to the house of Saul. But Joab, David's general, having gained the first victory, Abner never again took the field. About two years afterwards that general quarrelled with Ishbosheth, whom he had raised to the throne, and made arrangements to bring over the refractory tribes to the sway of David. He entered into a treaty with David for that purpose, whom he visited in person, and by whom he was hospitably received, but before he could accomplish his design he was treacherously assassinated by Joab, who dreaded the influence of such a powerful rival, and the union of the tribes was for a time retarded. Soon after this, Ishbosheth, while reposing at mid-day, was murdered by Reebab and Baanah, two officers of his own tribe of Benjamin—a fact which is specially noticed to show that they had the strongest ties to be faithful to the family of Saul, and how justly they deserved the exemplary punishment which David inflicted upon them. They cut off the head of the unfortunate Ishbosheth, and brought it to David, expecting to be liberally rewarded, but he condemned them to death, and expressed his detestation both at the crime itself, and the manner in which it was done. "As the Lord liveth," he said, "who hath redeemed my soul out of all adversity, when one told me, saying, Behold, Saul is dead, thinking to have brought good tidings, I took hold of him, and

slew him in Ziklag, who thought that I would have given him a reward for his tidings: How much more when wicked men have slain a righteous person in his own house, upon his own bed? Shall I not therefore now require his blood of your hand, and now take you away from the earth?" The two murderers were instantly put to death, their hands and their feet were cut off, and their bodies were exhibited in the city of Hebron, as a public mark of ignominy and detestation. The eleven tribes immediately submitted to David, although he took no advantage of the treacherous murder of Ishbosheth to hasten this desirable event. The heads of the tribes sent an embassy to him with the offer that he would become their ruler, as under Saul he had been their leader, because Jehovah had said of him, "Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be captain over Israel." They came with the whole army to Hebron, the then metropolis of Judah, and David having bound himself by an oath to observe the conditions on which he received the sceptre, homage was rendered to him, and the whole transaction was solemnized by a festival. David thus reigned only seven years and six months over the tribe of Judah, and he was at this time in the thirty-eighth year of his age.

Heretofore peculiarities apparent throughout the transactions now noticed claim our attention. It is evident from the procedure of the Hebrews, that at this period they were careful to recognise their theocracy, and they submitted to David only as a king appointed by Jehovah, who had proved himself to be such during the reign of Saul. The other is that "David made a league" with the heads of the tribes "in Hebron before the Lord." This, which is confirmed by several other instances, proves that the Hebrew monarchs were not absolute, but there were certain conditions, called leagues or covenants, which the newly elected kings pledged themselves to observe. It is not accurately known what these conditions were, yet we have suffi-

cient intimations throughout the historical Books of the Old Testament, that while the royal power comprehended many important privileges, it was also subject to several restrictions. The reader will find several remarks on the political constitution of the Hebrews in the lives of Solomon and Rehoboam.

The first act of David's reign over the united tribes was to undertake the siege of Jebus or Jerusalem, the citadel of which, called Zion, had hitherto remained in the possession of the Jebusites. That stronghold was taken, and as the city was conveniently situated in the boundaries of Judah and Benjamin, and in the territory of both, it became the metropolis of the kingdom, and David erected a palace on Mount Zion, which, on this account, was also called the City of David, and he is supposed to have first given to the city the name of Jerusalem, or the *City of Peace*.

As soon as the Philistines heard that David had become king of all the tribes, they declared war against him, and marched in battle array to the Valley of Rephaim. They sustained two successive defeats in this place by the Israelites, and David now commenced to regulate the affairs of his government, to improve his army, and to bestow special attention on the management of public worship. He resolved to transfer the ark of the covenant, the throne of the invisible King Jehovah, from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem. He gathered together thirty thousand chosen men of Israel to accompany him in this solemn affair, and the reason of his summoning so many of his principal officers to accompany him in this expedition probably was, "to possess," says Stackhouse, "the young people, who perhaps had heard nothing of the ark, on account of its long absence, with a proper veneration for it, when they saw the king and so many of the chief nobility waiting on it with a variety of music and public demonstration of joy." The honour of perfecting the ceremonial of the Hebrew worship was reserved for David, who, after taking Jerusalem,

adorned it with magnificent buildings, and rightly concluded that if the ark of God, the emblem of the Divine presence, was transferred to Jerusalem, the affairs of the whole kingdom connected with religion and justice would be conducted with regularity and order. The ark was removed from the house of Abinadab in Gibeah, and placed on what is called a *new cart* in our version—in reality, a magnificent carriage provided for the occasion. It was expressly commanded by Moses that the ark was to be carried on the shoulders of the Kohathites, and it is singular that on the present occasion they should have departed from the positive Law, either through forgetfulness, or perhaps inadvertently following the example of the Philistines, who had put the ark of God in the same manner on a new cart, 1 Sam. vi. 7, 8. The cart or carriage was driven by Uzzah and Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, the latter going before it, and followed by David, and “all the house of Israel, playing before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir-wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals.” It happened during the progress that when they came to a place called *Nachon's Threshing Floor*, the oxen yoked to the carriage stumbled, and shook the ark in such a manner that it was in danger of being overturned. Uzzah put forth his hand to support the tabernacle, when he was immediately struck dead, to the astonishment and grief of David. Here it is to be observed, that though the ark was to be carried on the shoulders of the Kohathites of the tribe of Levi, yet it was death for them to touch it, and this unfortunate Levite therefore violated an express command, which made his conduct more glaring after what had happened to the Bethshemites for merely looking into the ark. This awful display of Divine power so greatly affected David, that he appears to have become sensible of the error of the whole proceedings, and the ark was deposited in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite, where it remained three months.

It was then removed amid solemn rejoicings to Mount Zion, where David had “pitched a tabernacle” or temporary erection for its reception. After he had rendered the various burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, he “blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Hosts; and he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, as well to the women as men, to every one a cake of bread, and a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine. So all the people departed every one to his house.” The Rabbins, in reference to this feast, inform us that the “good piece of flesh” was the sixth part of a bullock, but the piece was probably not more than enough to furnish every person with a good meal. In the Vulgate it is rendered *roast beef*. The words *of wine*, as inserted in *italics* after the word *flagon*, are not in the original, and it is agreed that the word (*ashishah*) rendered *flagon* does not warrant that translation, but rather intimates some kind of cake of a sweet and pleasant description. The Septuagint renders the word by *pancake* here, and *honey-cake* in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xvi. 3.

On this occasion we are told that “David danced before the Lord with all his might,” and he was girded with a linen ephod—clothing himself in this manner out of reverence to God, and laying aside his royal robes not only as being too cumbersome, but because he was in the immediate presence of the Divine Majesty of the Invisible King of Israel; and, “as the ark of the Lord came into the city of David, Michal, Saul's daughter, looked through a window, and saw king David leaping and dancing before the Lord, and she despised him in her heart.” Michal, it will be recollected, had been given to David in marriage by her father, from whom she was afterwards forcibly separated, and married to another. The phrase rendered, *she despised him in her heart*, is perhaps too strong, and, from what follows, a charge of indecency is insinuated which the original text does not convey. The meaning of it is, that she thought David lowered

his own dignity by divesting himself of the ensigns of royalty, and taking so active a part in the rejoicings of the common people. She probably contrasted her father's stern and reserved character with the conduct of David on this occasion, not considering that his *dancing*—by which we are simply to understand his moving to certain serious and solemn strains of music, and not literally as that exercise is practised among us—was in strict accordance with the pious ceremony he was performing, and that his mixing with the public festivities of his people was a condescension becoming the greatest monarch. When the whole festivity had been concluded, and David was returning to his own household, he was met by Michal, who ironically addressed him in the language of derision and contempt:—"How glorious was the king of Israel to-day, who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants, as one of the vain fellows shamelessly (*openly*) uncovereth himself!" It is to be here observed that the word *shamelessly* is not in the original text, and it is not clear who are indicated by the *vain fellows*,—some applying them in a scornful sense to the Levites, on account of David appearing in the ephod, which was a part of their dress (see AARON), and others referring them to the lower class of the spectators. But David repelled the insinuations of his former wife, and justified his conduct, declaring that he thought nothing too mean for him to perform which was connected with the honour and service of God, and that the more he humbled himself for that purpose, the more he would be honoured and esteemed by the people. "It was before the Lord," he said, "who chose me before thy father, and before all his house, to appoint me ruler over the people of the Lord, over Israel; therefore will I play before the Lord, and I will yet be more vile than thus, and will yet be base in mine own sight; and of the maid-servants whom thou hast spoken of, of them shall I be had in honour."

The capital of David now became the

capital, if it may be so expressed, of the invisible King, and it was called the *City of God—the Holy City*, names which it always retained, because the Temple was afterwards built on Mount Moriah. This edifice David resolved to erect himself, and he communicated his intentions to the Prophet Nathan, who highly approved of them. But that Prophet was immediately commanded to inform him that while Jehovah accepted his pious resolutions, and was pleased with this act of respect to his Divine Majesty, he was at the same time rash in making any vow on this important matter without requesting his Divine assent and approval, and that he must therefore leave to his successor the charge of building a temple as a palace for the throne of God. On this occasion he received the promise of a succession of his house to the throne, and of an eternal kingdom for his posterity. This promise was so highly valued by David, that he seems to have had some conception of its extensive import: "The solemn transfer of the ark of the covenant," observes Jahn, "at which almost all the people were present, had made a deep impression on their minds, and had awakened them to a sincere adoration of Jehovah. These favourable dispositions David wished to uphold and strengthen, by suitable regulations in the service of the Priests and Levites, especially by the instructive and animating Psalms, which were composed partly by himself, and partly by other poets and prophets. These were sung not only by the Levites at all the sacrifices, accompanied with instrumental music, but also by the people while on their way to Jerusalem to attend the feasts. By such means, without coercive measures, David brought the whole nation to forget their idols, and to worship Jehovah alone: he also made their religion honourable and acceptable even to foreigners."

From these pious transactions, which so greatly elevate and distinguish the character of this celebrated Hebrew monarch, we now turn to the great successes and glorious conquests in which

the arms of the Israelites were victorious in almost every quarter; and indeed, as is subsequently noticed, the long reign of David was scarcely disturbed by any other means than by the criminal affairs, and attempts of his own family. We find him conquering the Philistines, and fulfilling the prediction of Balaam respecting the Moabites, the captives of whom, in conformity with a well-known usage of Oriental warfare, he caused to lie down, and instead of destroying the whole, as the Mosaic Law authorised, and as they all probably expected, he marked off a certain proportion to be spared, "and so the Moabites became David's servants, and brought gifts." In like manner the Nomade Arabs, the Amalekites, and the Edomites, were subdued by his powerful arms, among the latter of whom he placed strong garrisons; the king of Zobah, an ally of the Assyrians, who, in conjunction with his allies, brought a formidable army into the field, was compelled to remain on the eastern side of the Euphrates, and leave to the Hebrews the kingdom of Damascus as far as Berytus. In this war, which was doubtless severe and bloody, David not only completely routed all his enemies, but took immense spoils. Besides the "gifts," or tribute, which he exacted, he carried the "shields of gold that were on the servants of Hadadezer" to Jerusalem, and he "took exceeding much brass." Toi, king of Hamath, who had been severely chastised by the king of Zobah, and who rejoiced at his defeat, sent his son to form a treaty with the Hebrew conqueror, accompanied by a splendid present of "vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and vessels of brass, which also King David did dedicate unto the Lord, with the silver and gold that he had dedicated of all nations that he had subdued." Thus, as the inspired historian emphatically observes, "the Lord preserved David whithersoever he went"—the success of his arms confirmed the Hebrew nation still more in their religion, and inspired all the neighbouring people with reverence for the God of Israel.

At this time we find David appointing the chief officers of the kingdom. Joab was entrusted with the command of the army; Jehoshaphat was named the remembrancer, or writer of chronicles; Zadok and Abiathar were the priests; Seraiah was the "scribe," or secretary; Benaiah was appointed to the command of the Cherethites and Pelethites, supposed to be the guards about the king's person; and his sons were elevated to distinguished rank. David also remembered his oath respecting the family of Saul, and, from a tender recollection of his intimate friend Jonathan, religiously performed his promise of taking care of his descendants. Jonathan had a son named Mephibosheth, who was lame. He summoned this person to his presence, and treated him with the greatest affection, returning him all the paternal property of his grandfather Saul, and informing him that he would appear at the royal table as one of the king's sons—thus placing Jonathan's son in the same analogous situation which he had himself held in the court of Saul.

About three years after this, B.C. 1035, according to the Bible chronology, Nahash, the king of the Ammonites, died, and was succeeded by his son Hanun. David recollected the kindness shown to him by Nahash, in affording him protection when in exile, and thought he was obliged to acknowledge it by sending messengers to condole with and congratulate Hanun. But the advisers of the king of Ammon either wilfully or ignorantly misinterpreted this act of David's friendship. They represented to Hanun that the real design of the king of Israel was to "search the city, to overthrow it"—that these messengers were spies—and that the condolence for the death of his father was all a pretence to conceal his own ambitious projects. Hanun, acting on the belief of these misrepresentations, which appeared to him by no means improbable, considering David's well-known military reputation and his extensive conquests, inflicted the greatest indignities on the persons of the

messengers. He "shaved off one half of their beards, and cut off their garments in the middle," and in this degraded and contemptuous condition he ordered them to return to their master. When this extraordinary treatment of his peaceful ambassadors was made known to David he sent a deputation to meet them, "because the men were greatly ashamed," and they were ordered to remain at Jericho until their beards were grown. The shame of the men and the indignation of David clearly intimated that scarcely any insult could exceed that which the king of Israel's ambassadors received from Hanun, and it would still be so considered by those nations of the East, among whom that appendage to the human face is cherished. The Arabs of the present day hold it a mark of infamy to lose the beard, and many of them would rather die than incur that punishment; and as the Hebrews, like other Oriental nations, wore long flowing garments, scarcely any thing could be more disgraceful than this cutting off of their clothes, and exposing their persons. The Ammonites soon discovered that David was resolved to inflict upon them the most summary vengeance for these gross indignities, and they called to their assistance twenty thousand men of the Syrians of Beth-rehob and Zobah, of Ish-tob twelve thousand, and of the king of Maacah one thousand. Against these forces Joab took the field, and gained a complete victory. The Syrians rallied, and gave battle to David at Helam, but they sustained another severe defeat, with the loss of their general, seven hundred chariots, and forty thousand horsemen. They were glad to make peace with David, and to become tributary, having received a check which made them long cautious to render assistance to the Ammonites.

But while this war was proceeding, and Joab was vigorously prosecuting the siege of Rabbah against the Ammonites, David became engaged in some unhappy transactions at Jerusalem. Every reader of the Scripture history is familiar with that truly lamentable and criminal inter-

course with the wife of Uriah, and his order to destroy her husband—two most enormous crimes, which, as they are noticed in other parts of the present work, need not be here introduced. Most truly did the Prophet Nathan inform him that he had given "occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme;" and every sceptical writer has carefully remembered to indulge an impious jest at this and the other criminal actions which David, it cannot be denied, at various times committed. They have sneered at the designation by which the perpetrator of those offences is designated of being *the man after God's own heart*, and they have daringly impugned the holiness of that great Being who is of "purer eyes than to behold iniquity." They have forgotten that there is no attempt at concealment of this or of any other offence by the inspired writers—that, on the contrary, it is detailed with a minuteness most evident, and that the story is told in such a manner as to excite, in every virtuous mind, the utmost reprobation at the whole transaction, while the punishment which followed was not to be limited to himself individually, but was to be visited on his descendants, and the "sword was never to depart from his house." It might indeed be urged that David, upright and pious though he was, was nevertheless frail and fallible, as not only this but several other transactions were melancholy proofs; and it might be extenuated—certainly not for a moment excused—by a reference to the habits and manner, as well as to the licentious despotism, of Oriental monarchs. But the truth is, that the adultery with Bathsheba and the murder of Uriah are shocking crimes, which David himself is so far from excusing, that he confesses and laments them with the greatest horror. Yet "how earnest was his repentance, and with what submission to the Divine will did he bear those calamities which were sent for his punishment, and which, as they were caused by his own children, must have been so much the more distressing to his tender paternal

feelings!" When the affecting parable of the ewe lamb was propounded to him by Nathan, and the Prophet caused him to be his own judge and applied it to himself, his eyes were opened to the enormous and fatal crimes of which he was the perpetrator, while his conscience testified to him that the judgments denounced against him by Jehovah were righteous and deserved. He confessed his sin and was forgiven, yet the Almighty inflicted upon him those temporal punishments which the Prophet intimated, that "his soul might be saved in the day of the Lord," and that others admonished by his example, might be more afraid to offend. "The remainder of his days," as Dr Hales observes, "was as disastrous as the beginning had been prosperous. Rape, incest, murder, and rebellion, raged among his children; he was deserted by his friends, reviled by his enemies, banished from his capital, plunged into the deepest affliction by the ingratitude and death of his favourite and rebellious son Absalom, and to fill up the measure of his calamities, had a dreadful plague brought upon his subjects by his last offence, so that he died exhausted at seventy years of age, still older in constitution than in years.

The child, the offspring of this adulterous intercourse, died, as Jehovah had announced by his Prophet, notwithstanding all David's intercessions, prayers, and fastings. After the period for mourning the death of her husband had expired, commonly supposed to have been seven days, during which the party ate nothing till sunset, Bathsheba became the wife of David, and subsequently the mother of Solomon. Of all his wives Bathsheba seems to have been the most tenderly beloved, and to have exerted the greatest influence over him. David was soon afterwards roused from self-indulgence by some messengers from Joab, informing him that he had "fought against Rabbah, and taken the city of waters.—Now therefore," said he, "gather the rest of the people together, and encamp against the city and take it, lest I take the city, and call it after my own

name." To understand this magnanimous conduct of Joab, it is necessary to observe that the kings of Israel could not obtain the immediate honour without gaining, or at least completing, the victory in person, and history affords many analogies of military commanders awarding to their sovereigns or superiors in command the victories they had themselves gained. David "took the crown of their king (of the Ammonites) from off his head, and found it to weigh a talent of gold, and there were precious stones in it, and it was set upon David's head; and he brought also exceeding much spoil out of the city." The statement respecting the *weight* of the crown in this passage has called forth various opinions, it being such (125 lb.) that no one could wear it on his head even on mere state occasions. Bishop Patrick suggests that this crown was of the *value* (L.6000), not the *weight*, of a talent: others suppose the weight assigned was that of a Syrian talent, which was only one fourth of the Hebrew; while others think that not the crown, but the cluster of precious stones, was removed from it, and placed on David's head. It is, however, sufficiently ascertained that in ancient times there were crowns of great weight, size, and magnificence, not worn *upon*, but suspended *over* the head, namely, over the throne.

But another transaction connected with the capture of Rabbah deserves to be noticed. David "brought forth the people that were therein, and he put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick kiln, and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon." This is the first notice chronologically of the saw in Scripture, and the passage now quoted will be found on examination to differ in some slight particulars from the parallel one, 1 Chron. xx. 3. Interpreters differ in opinion on the meaning of these texts. Some think that we are to understand literally that David put the Ammonites to death in the manner intimated, and that he perhaps did so

after an example set by themselves in the treatment of their captives. "If any apology for David's conduct," says Stackhouse, "be deemed necessary, it should be recollected that these Ammonites were monsters of barbarity, as appears from the conditions they offered to the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead, 1 Sam. xi. 2; and the punishments here mentioned were inflicted by the Ammonites themselves on those Jews whom they took prisoners. David, therefore, when he conquered their country and reduced their capital city, used them with the same cruelty—not every one of them indiscriminately, but such only as had appeared in arms against him, and had either advised or approved of the advice of putting such a disgrace on his messengers." But others suppose, from a careful examination of the Hebrew text in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xx. 3, that David made slaves of the Ammonites, and employed them in laborious services. "The words," says Dr Chandler, "admit of being translated, *He put them to the saw, to iron mines, and to iron axes, and transported to the brick-kilns*, meaning, that he reduced them to slavery, and put them to hard drudgery. This interpretation, if it be admitted, vindicates David from inhumanity, which, as many conceive, attaches to the sense of the common translation."

We have now some scenes disclosed to us in the life of David, which introduce us to those calamities which the Prophet Nathan had declared would befall him for the enormous offence he had committed in the matter of Bathsheba and Uriah, and these must have been doubly bitter to him because he had himself set an example to his sons of glaring licentiousness. "Now, therefore," said the Prophet, "the sword shall never depart from thine house, because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy wife. Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and

he shall be with thy wives in the sight of this sun." Tamar, the sister of Absalom by the same mother, was forcibly ravished by her half-brother Amnon, David's eldest son, all the revolting circumstances alluding to it being planned by Jonadab the son of Shimeah, David's own brother, into which David himself was unwittingly drawn, as it was by his advice that Tamar went to her brother's house, where he pretended to be sick, and requested her to come and "make a couple of cakes in his sight, that he might eat at her hand." This unhappy affair caused the murder of Amnon by the command of Absalom. To quote the expressive summary of the pious Bishop Sanderson—"As Nathan foretold to him, so a world of mischief and misery fell out to him from this one presumptuous act; his daughter [rather *step-daughter*] defiled by her brother—that brother slain by another brother [Absalom]—a strong conspiracy raised against him by his own son [the same Absalom]—his concubines openly defiled by the same son—himself afflicted by the untimely death of that son who was his darling—reviled and cursed to his face by a base unworthy companion, besides many other troubles, affronts, and vexations."

The most considerable and serious of the misfortunes above enumerated was the rebellion of Absalom, who compelled his father to flee from Jerusalem in a wretched condition, with his head covered, his feet bare, and his ears saluted by the groans of his subjects; while the usurping son entered that city in triumph, and literally acted in the manner intimated by Nathan. As all the transactions connected with the enterprise of Absalom are narrated in other parts of the present work, it is unnecessary to repeat them here. It may be merely observed, that during this rebellion, when David was very nearly reduced to the humble condition in which he was found by Samuel, and from which he was only extricated, humanly speaking, by the persons who acted a treacherous part towards Absalom, he was met by Ziba,

the servant of Mephibosheth, with "a couple of asses saddled, and upon them two hundred loaves of bread, and an hundred bunches of raisins, and an hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of wine." In reply to David's question Ziba informed him that this supply of provisions was for his use. The king then asked where Mephibosheth was, and Ziba craftily replied that he had chosen to remain at Jerusalem, persuaded that the result of the commotions might be the re-establishment of the family of Saul on the throne, and that he, being his grandson, would consequently be king. This well contrived fiction of Ziba was readily believed by David, who instantly bestowed the whole of Mephibosheth's property on him for his pretended loyalty, which it was the sole object of Ziba to secure by his falsehood. This introduces us to the many abuses to which David was exposed from the hands of Saul, who accused him of being a man of blood, and viewed the rebellion of Absalom as a just punishment for the mischiefs they alleged he had done to Saul and his whole family. The inspired historian gives an instance of one of those trying and insulting encounters. Not long after he had dismissed Ziba, when he came to Bahurim, a man named Shimei, connected with Saul's family, purposely met him in the most insulting manner, and cast stones at him and his followers, exclaiming, "Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial: the Lord hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned, and the Lord hath delivered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son, and behold thou art taken in thy mischief, because thou art a bloody man." The account given by Josephus corresponds with the preceding:—"But when David came near a place called Bachora, there came a kinsman of Saul named Semei, who threw stones at him, and reviled him; and when his friends protected him, he abused him yet worse, calling him a bloody man, and the author of many mischiefs,

and bidding him leave the land as an impure and execrable person; and he gave God thanks that he had deprived him of the kingdom, and punished him by means of his own son for what he had committed against his master." Abishai, the brother of Zeruiah, requested permission to cut off this "dead dog's" head for his wanton, false, and unjustifiable reproaches, but the distressed monarch sternly prohibited the soldier from injuring Shimei. "What have I to do with you," he asked, "ye sons of Zeruiah? so let him curse, because the Lord hath said unto him, Curse David. Who shall say then, Wherefore hast thou done so?" He added, in the hearing of Abishai and of all his followers—"Behold, my son, which came forth of my bowels, seeketh my life; how much more may this Benjamite do it? Let him alone, and let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him. It may be that the Lord will look on mine affliction, and that the Lord will requite me good for his cursing this day." He bore this insult with great patience, piously acknowledging the hand of God; and when his affairs were again settled he pardoned Shimei, who was the first to submit, and to implore his mercy. David felt the humiliation in which he was placed, and though conscious that all Shimei's reproaches were unmerited, he evinced the generosity of his temper, and his humble hope that Jehovah would reward him for his patient submission to the punishment allotted to him. "Whether Shimei," observes Stackhouse, "had been a personal sufferer in the fall of Saul's family, or what else had exasperated him against David, does not appear; but it seems as if he had conceived some most flagrant offence against him, when neither the presence of a king nor the terror of his guards could restrain him from such behaviour. It is a proof, too, how much the king had fallen into contempt, when a private person could vent his malice in such a manner with impunity."

David was one of the fondest of fathers—his indulgence to his children was

excessive, and, as a consequence, he was made to suffer severely for this attachment. In no instance is this more conspicuous than in the case of Absalom. Although that bold prodigal had done him every possible injury, not only as a king, but as a father and a private individual, his charge to the leaders of the army appointed to crush Absalom's rebellion shows with what reluctance he took the field against him and a part of his own subjects. He had some intentions of assuming the command himself, but he was unanimously opposed by the soldiers; and there can be little doubt that the preservation of Absalom was one of his chief motives. When he found himself obliged to yield to the general request that he would remain behind, he earnestly entreated Joab and the other commanders, in the hearing of the army passing in review before him, to "deal gently with the young man, even with Absalom," as if his crimes were more the results of youthful folly than of his nature. In the battle which followed the rebel forces of Absalom were defeated, and the usurper was himself killed by Joab while he was suspended in a very remarkable manner (see ABSALOM). The king had issued his peremptory order—"Beware that none touch the young man Absalom"—but Joab was not to be deterred by David's inclinations or commands, and he was probably induced to kill the usurper by the desire of revenging the personal wrongs he had suffered from him, and by the fear that the king, in his fondness and affection for him, might restore him to his favour, and give him farther opportunities of causing public disturbances. When he was informed of his death he retired to his apartment overwhelmed with grief, exclaiming, in language which must reach the heart of every parent who has experienced the same misfortune—"O my son Absalom! My son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" When we consider the circumstances of the case, however, and the infamous

character of Absalom, who had nothing to recommend him but his external appearance, it must be admitted that "the grief of David," as Dr Chandler observes, "was as immoderate as it was unreasonable, and showed the intemperate passionate affection he bore to the unnatural and impious youth. It damped the common joy of his friends and soldiers for the glorious victory, to hear the excessive grief he expressed for his son, insomuch that they almost repented of their success, and stole into the city where David was, as if they had been dishonourably defeated." The conduct of the king roused the indignation of Joab, who instantly sought an interview, and instead of sympathizing with him, and calmly representing the ill consequences which might ensue if he continued to indulge that excessive grief, remonstrated with him in the most imperious manner, and almost justifying to his face the assassination of his son. He declared to David that his lamentations for Absalom plainly intimated that if all those had been slain who put down the rebellion, and had saved the lives of himself and his family, and if Absalom had lived it would have pleased him well; and he concluded with this emphatic intimation—"Now, therefore, arise, go forth, and speak comfortably to the heart of thy servants; for I swear by the Lord, if thou go not forth, there will not tarry one with thee this night; and that will be worse unto thee than all the evil that befell thee from thy youth until now."

The king was prudent to adopt this advice, and the affairs of the kingdom were in a short time adjusted. Shimei was pardoned:—Mephibosheth had an interview, and explained the crafty procedure of Ziba, proving at the same time that he was neither concerned in Absalom's enterprise, nor ever entertained any ambitious views of personal advancement;—an attempt at insurrection caused by Sheba, a Benjamite, and probably a kinsman of the family of Saul, was put down;—and David shut up the ten women of his harem who had been defiled by

Absalom, in close and perpetual retirement, that their appearance might not revive the memory of his son's wickedness. To appease the Gibeonites, and to put an end to a famine of three years, inflicted for some cruel proceedings of Saul against them, two sons and five grandsons of that unfortunate king were delivered up to them, who were all put to death; but as a mark of respect to the whole house of Saul, and to show that he entertained no personal enmity to his family, David carried the bodies of Saul, of Jonathan, and of those put to death by the Gibeonites, to be honourably interred in the sepulchre of Kish, their immediate ancestor, at Zelah in the territory of Benjamin.

The last great error which David committed, and which excited the Divine indignation against him, was his *numbering* of the people. There have been various opinions as to the nature of his sin in this transaction, which must certainly have been of a very objectionable appearance even in popular estimation at the time, for we find Joab, a man not very scrupulous on most points, giving his decided opinion of the danger of such a measure. The common statement is, that the *act* of taking the census was in itself culpable, as indicating a sinful pride of the king in contemplating the number of his subjects. "David's crime," says Bishop Sherlock, "in numbering the people appears to have consisted in a want of confidence in God. Had he acted in the true spirit of a king of Israel, he would have been less solicitous about the number of his forces, and would have trusted God with the work which He had undertaken, and which He had constantly, and in David's case, in a very particular manner, faithfully discharged." It is not a little singular that this affair of David had at first considerable influence in rendering the people in most European countries averse to any census of the population, when such enumerations began to be seriously entertained by their respective Governments. We are not to conclude, however, that the numbering

of the Israelites was at *all times* sinful, though it was undoubtedly so in this case of David. On the contrary, we find that two enumerations of the Hebrews were taken in the time of Moses by the express command of God himself. As it respects David, he wanted to ascertain the number of men *capable of bearing arms*, which, in the spirit and intention in which it was done, was an express act of distrust in Jehovah, and in opposition to the promise in the Law. "When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses, and chariots, and a people more than thou, be not afraid of them, for the Lord thy God is with thee;" and it would have been well for David if he had then reflected that "God hath no pleasure in the strength of an horse, neither delighteth he in any man's legs." There are some discrepancies in the parallel text respecting this transaction, especially in the exact numbers, 2 Sam. xxiv. 9; 1 Chron. xxii. 5. In the former we are told that the fighting men of the tribes, exclusive of Benjamin and Levi, amounted to 800,000, and of the tribe of Judah, 500,000,—in all, 1,300,000 "valiant men that drew the sword;" in the latter the numbers of the tribes given are 1,100,000, and of Judah, 470,000—in all, 1,570,000. There are various explanations of this discrepancy, but it is probable that the numbers in each of the texts convey the view of the men capable of bearing arms, by supposing that there is an omission of some class of persons in the lower included in the higher account.

For this transaction David was severely punished. He was indeed conscious of the sin he had committed, and was sincerely confessing it, when he was visited by the Prophet Gad, who was commanded by Jehovah to offer him the choice of three of the greatest national calamities, either of which would soon diminish the number of his fighting men, and show him the folly of trusting in an arm of flesh. "Shall seven years of famine come unto thee in thy land? or wilt thou flee three months before thine

enemies while they pursue thee? or that there be three days' pestilence in thy land? Now advise, and see what answer I shall return to Him that sent me." Of the three punishments offered, David chose the pestilence. He said to the Prophet—"I am in a great strait; let us fall now into the hand of the Lord, for his mercies are great, and let me not fall into the hand of man." The pestilence was sent, and 70,000 persons fell victims to the dreadful mortality. We are not to suppose, however, that this destruction of life was caused by *David's fault* exclusively; we are also told that *the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel*. "The people themselves," says Dr Waterland, "had sins many and great which deserved punishment, and for which they would probably have been before punished, if it had not been for God's favour towards David, who would have suffered in common with them. Now, therefore, when both king and people had deserved a correction or judgment, God was pleased to let loose his anger against both." The same judicious view is taken by Bishop Horne:—"The anger of the Lord was kindled *against Israel*, and, as a consequence of this, David was excited to number the people. The offences of the people called for punishment, and on the numbering the people an opportunity was taken to inflict it."

David was now advancing in years, and the only other event of any consequence which occurred during the remainder of his reign was the attempt of his eldest surviving son Adonijah to secure the crown, which was speedily checked by the proclamation of Solomon as his successor. We find him also in a solemn assembly declaring God's favour towards him, and reciting the divine promise that his son Solomon was to build the house of God at Jerusalem. "As for me," he said, "I had it in mine heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and for the footstool of our God, and had made ready for the building; but God said unto me, *Thou shalt not build an house for my*

name, because thou hast been a man of war, and hast shed blood." He then gave Solomon a series of pious and affectionate exhortations respecting the erection of the Temple, and to prosecute the work with unwearied courage. He made a most liberal offering of gold, silver, brass (copper), iron, precious stones, and other valuable and necessary articles, in which he was followed by the leading men of the tribes, and he put into Solomon's possession all the materials and patterns he had prepared for the intended edifice.

The dying injunctions of this great man to Solomon concerning Joab and Shimei have been severely censured. The former, notwithstanding all his crimes, had been always faithful to him; he was brave, he served his master to good purpose; he had kept his situation, his influence, and authority; and David knew that dangerous consequences might ensue if he attempted to punish him. As for the latter, he had received a pardon for the atrocious insults he had heaped upon the king in his misfortunes, yet that circumstance is carefully recited, as well as the murder of Abner and Amasa by Joab. They had both, however, committed recent offences which deserved punishment. Joab was deeply implicated in the insurrection of Adonijah; and Shimei, at all times a dangerous person, transgressed the conditions by which he was to be protected in the new reign, and went to Gath, a suspicious quarter. It is clear that the crimes of the one deserved punishment, otherwise David might have been accused of conniving at them; the other deliberately violated his oath to the new sovereign, and had forfeited all claims to protection.

David died at Jerusalem in the seventieth year of his age, and was buried in Mount Zion, called after his own name—the *City of David*.—"He died," says the inspired historian, "in a good old age, full of days, riches, and honour." David appears to have survived the coronation of Solomon half a year, for though he reigned seven years and six months over Judah in Hebron,

and thirty-three years over all Israel, yet his reign is reckoned forty years. This interval, Dr Hales supposes, he seems to have employed in the public acts and regulations contained in the five last chapters of the First Book of Chronicles. The sepulchre of this great prince was held in the utmost veneration by the Jews. It remained in the Apostolic times, as is intimated by St Peter, Acts ii. 29. It was twice opened, some centuries after the death of its illustrious occupant—one of those times by Herod the Great, in quest of the treasure supposed to be concealed in it; but Josephus informs us that he found nothing except the remains of the royal ornaments with which the king had been buried. In the person of our blessed Saviour, who was “David’s son and David’s Lord,” the family of this great Hebrew monarch became, humanly speaking, extinct. It was prophesied, ages before, that the then reigning family of David would become lowly and obscure, and that the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh came, and “to him would the gathering of the people be.” These, and many other intimations, were literally fulfilled in all the circumstances attending the advent, life, and death of the Messiah, whose appearance David, “the sweet singer of Israel,” himself announced. An eternal kingdom and an ever-enduring throne were promised to David, and this is explained by the statement that the throne of David should stand as long as the sun and moon would endure in the heavens. The family of David was accordingly always preserved, though it was thrice—especially under Jehoram and Athaliah—in the utmost danger of extinction. Hence the Prophets, even in those times when the kingdom of Judah was overthrown, and the posterity of David, degraded and obscure, were always looking for some great descendant of that king, to whom the heathen would submit—a hope derived from the blessing pronounced on Abraham. The name of David, like that of the great Patriarch, is a really venerated name, because

it is associated with Him in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed.

Various persons, of course impostors, have appeared among the Jews at various times since the Christian era, who pretended to be the descendants of David, and who have accordingly laid claim to princely rank. In Spain, we are told that two Jewish families were believed to be descended from the Hebrew monarch, and a sort of right was conceded to them by the Jews to rule over their nation in that country. The Rabbi Manasseh, who endeavoured to obtain the government of the Jews both in France and Spain, founded his claim to that distinction on his marriage with a daughter of the house of David. Those two pretended branches of David’s descendants were rival candidates for supreme power among those Jews, but according to the admission even of the Rabbins they both became extinct in the twelfth century. “The Talmudists, who wrote at Babylon,” says Jahn, “extol the splendours of that city, and pride themselves on their uncorrupted descent from the house of David. They found their claims to noble birth on a supposition, the correctness of which is by no means admitted. They believe that all the dregs of the people returned with Ezra to Jerusalem. Ezra carried with him, say they, the *chaff of the nation*, and left the *pure wheat* at Babylon. They add, that every country in the world is worthless in comparison with Judea, and that Judea must yield in excellence to Babylon. It is very evident that they flatter their self-love, and deceive themselves in their claims to a descent from David. The descendants of David were so highly honoured in Judea, that they would not leave it to groan in slavery under foreign princes. Forty two thousand families returned to Judea with Ezra; thirty thousand of those families belonged to Benjamin and Judah, and they doubtless formed by far the largest part of those tribes. The twelve thousand families, the heads of which are not mentioned, were perhaps composed partly of the

Ten Tribes, and partly of the lower orders of the tribes of Judah, who could not produce an unbroken genealogy. We are not therefore to look to Babylon for the descendants of David."

It is unnecessary in this place to give any review of the life and character of this celebrated monarch. In the present sketch the reader will find all the principal events of the former narrated in a suitable manner, and accompanied by such remarks and practical observations as these suggested; and as it respects the latter, it is well known to every reader of the Scriptures, and is eloquently discussed in innumerable theological and pious works of every description, and in none more so than in Dr Chandler's "Critical History of the Life of David." Music in his reign was held in the highest estimation by the Hebrews, and his attachment to the study and practice of it, as well as the great number of musicians appointed by him for the performance of religious rites and ceremonies, could not fail to extend its influence, and to enhance its perfections. It was during his reign also that music was first honoured by being admitted in the ministry of sacrifice and worship of the ark.

But what shall we say of the Psalms of David—those divine lyrics which are the glory of the Church—the consolation of the penitent—the delight of the grateful—and the admiration of the pious? Those sacred compositions have engaged the attention of the most learned men, who have done much to illustrate their meaning, and to enforce their practical application. In connection with them David may well be styled by the Hebrews the *Sire of Sacred Song*, for they not only procured his own nation such a musical establishment as seems to have been unequalled in any other kingdom in the world, but they are still held in the utmost reverence, and daily form part of the public service of the Church, while they are the effusions which hallow the private worship of the closet and of the family circle. And justly are they so used and appreciated throughout the Christian

world, for they abound with such exalted strains of piety and devotion, and such transcendent and animated descriptions of the power, the wisdom, the mercy, and the goodness of God, that it is impossible to peruse them in a right frame of mind without humbly adoring the great Creator and Governor of the universe. At one time we have the prayers of distress, the language of confession, the sincere acknowledgment of sin, with supplications for mercy; at another we have the praises and exultation of triumph, the sincere homage of the grateful heart, and devout expressions of gratitude to God, the Benefactor, Protector, and Saviour of his people. But the Psalms are in reality an epitome of the Holy Scriptures, and as such are admirably adapted to the purposes of public and private devotion. They occasionally treat of the creation and formation of the world, the dispensations of Providence, and the economy of grace. We have in them the transactions of the Patriarchs, the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, their journey through the Wilderness, and their settlement in Canaan; their Law, priesthood and ritual; the exploits of their great men wrought through faith; their sins and captivities; their repentances and restorations. They tell us of the sufferings and victories of David; and of the peaceful, happy, and splendid reign of Solomon. In them we have intimated the advent of the Messiah, with its effects and consequences; his incarnation, birth, life, passion, death, resurrection, ascension, kingdom, and priesthood; the effusion of the Holy Spirit; the rejection of the Jews; the conversion of the Gentiles; the establishment, increase, and perpetuity of the Christian Church; the end of the world, the general judgment, the condemnation of the wicked, and the final triumph of the righteous with their Lord and King. Such are the subjects presented by the Psalms to our imaginations. "Composed upon particular occasions," says Bishop Horne, "yet designed for general use—delivered out as services for the Israelites under the [

yet no less adapted to the circumstances under the Gospel, they present religion to us in the most engaging dress, communicating those truths which philosophy could never investigate, in a style which poetry can never equal. Calculated alike to profit and to please, they inform the understanding, elevate the affections, and entertain the imagination. Indited under the influence of Him to whom all hearts are open and all events foreknown, they suit mankind in all situations, grateful as the manna which descended from above and conformed itself to every palate. The fairest productions of human art after a few perusals, like gathered flowers, wither in our hands and lose their fragranc; but these unfading plants of Paradise become, as we are more accustomed to them, still more and more beautiful—their bloom appears to be daily heightened—fresh colours are emitted—and new sweets are extracted from them. He who has once tasted their excellencies will desire to taste them again, and he who tastes them oftenest will relish them best.”

In the original the Book of Psalms is entitled the *Book of Praises*; or in the common editions of the Septuagint it is simply entitled *Psalms*; in the Syriac version, *The Book of Psalms of David the King and Prophet*; and in the Arabic, *The Book of Psalms of David the Prophet, the King of the Sons of Israel*. It is not known by whom the Book was compiled in its present form. The Psalms are arranged without any regard to chronology, nor are the titles prefixed to them always designed to point out the author, but often apply to the persons appointed to set them to music, while these sometimes also appear to be simply names of instruments, or directions for the choice of tunes. Some of the Rabbins hold that it was the work of David to collect them in their present form, forgetting that some of them were written long after his time; others ascribe the compilation to Ezra. We shall probably come near the truth by combining the two statements, and inferring that David

formed a collection of Psalms written by himself, and of others composed in and before his time, which he arranged for the sacred service; and this collection might be used in the first or Solomon's Temple. Those compositions would afterwards be added by Ezra which had been written down to the time of the return of the Jews from captivity, and the foundation of the second Temple. In a general sense the Psalms are ascribed to David, because he wrote more of them than any other individual, though some have very erroneously contended that he was the author of the whole of them, when it is certain that some of them were not only written as late as the captivity, but others, and especially one, in the time of Moses. The titles in the Book of Psalms in our version ascribe seventy-one of them to David, and the Septuagint gives him eleven others; but it is probable that some of these are assigned to him without any authority, and it may be as safely assumed that many of those to which no names are prefixed are of his composition.

DEBORAH, a prophetess, and wife of Lapidoth, is celebrated in sacred history as the female judge of the Israelites when under that peculiar form of government. We are told that she “dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel, in Mount Ephraim, and the children of Israel came up to her for judgment.” The traditionary place of her residence is still pointed out, and it is remarkable that a great meeting or fair is stately held at it, as it has been since Deborah's time, at which, amongst other business, all disputes are settled, and quarrels adjusted between rival tribes. Deborah commissioned Barak to put himself at the head of 10,000 men of the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulun, and take the field against Sisera, the commander of the army of Jabin, king of Canaan, assuring him of a decisive victory. Barak insisted that she should accompany him, to which she consented, and he utterly “discomfited Sisera, and all his chariots, and all his host;”—the

unfortunate Canaanite leader being himself slain in his fugitive retreat. Deborah, in conjunction with Barak, sang the noble triumphal ode inserted in the Book of Judges, which has been ably analyzed and illustrated by Bishop Lowth and others. Dr Hales says that "its design seems to be two-fold—religious and political:—first, to thank God for the recent victory and deliverance of Israel from Canaanitish bondage and oppression; next, to celebrate the zeal with which some of the tribes volunteered their services against the common enemy; and to censure the lukewarmness and apathy of others who remained at home, and thus betrayed the public cause, and by this contrast and exposure, to heal those fatal divisions among the tribes so injurious to the common weal."

DELILAH, a female of the Valley of Sorek, beloved by Samson, who for eleven hundred pieces of silver betrayed him into the hands of the Philistines. This was achieved by Delilah extracting the secret from him where his great strength lay. See SAMSON.

DEMAS, one of St Paul's fellow-labourers whom he mentions to Timothy as having "foraken him" because he "loved this present world," probably meaning thereby his own ease, convenience, and profit, or his temporal safety. The ancient writers explain this by saying that he left the Apostle at a time of danger.

DEMETRIUS, an artificer of Ephesus, who "made little silver shrines for Diana, which brought no small gain unto the craftsmen." These appear to have been miniature representations in silver of the magnificent Temple of Diana in that city, in each of which a little image of the goddess was probably placed, and they were bought by strangers from motives both of devotion and curiosity. This individual, calling together his fellow-workmen, succeeded by his inflammatory misrepresentation in raising an uproar against St Paul and his companions Gaius and Aristarchus, who were in considerable danger on the occasion.

The principal magistrate of the city, called the *town-clerk* in our version, succeeded in allaying this tumult by a very judicious speech. See PAUL.

DEMETRIUS, a Christian disciple mentioned by St John in his Third Epistle as one who had "good report of all men, and of the truth itself," which intimates that his temper and conduct were conformable to its precepts. Nothing is known of his personal history.

DIDYMUS. See THOMAS.

DINAH, the only daughter of Jacob by Leah. See JACOB.

DIONYSIUS, a member of that body of magistrates or judges who sat in the court of the Areopagus, or Mar's Hill, at Athens, distinguished for their gravity, wisdom, and authority. He was converted to Christianity by St Paul's celebrated address to the Athenian philosophers.

DIOTREPHES, a person severely censured by St John in his Third Epistle, as one who prated "with malicious words." It is uncertain who he was. Grotius thinks that he was a Gentile convert who would not admit the Jews; but it seems more probable that he was a Jew who opposed the admission of the Gentiles, and set himself up at the head of a party in opposition to the Apostles.

DOEG, the "chiefest of the herdsmen that belonged to Saul," is called an Edomite, and he must consequently have become a proselyte to the Jewish religion, though the Rabbins allege that he was a real Israelite, and is merely mentioned as an Edomite because he had formerly dwelt in Edom. The office he held, as governor of the royal flocks, was one of very considerable importance, and is often mentioned by ancient writers as existing in most countries with which they were acquainted. Doeg happened to be at the sacerdotal city of Nob, where he saw Ahimelech give to David the shew-bread and the sword of Goliath. This he afterwards mentioned to Saul, who summoned Ahimelech and the priests before him, and after upbraiding them for their treachery, he commanded his

attendants to put them to death. These officers refused, but Saul found a willing minister of cruelty in the person of Doeg, who massacred eighty-five of them, and thus were accomplished the threatenings of Jehovah against the house of the venerable Eli. Abiathar indeed escaped on this occasion, and was afterwards exalted to the high priesthood, but it was one of the first acts of Solomon's reign to "thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord, that he might fulfil the word of the Lord which he spake concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh."

DORCAS, or ΤΑΒΙΘΙΑ, a female disciple at Joppa, who "was full of good

works and alms-deeds which she did." St Peter restored her to life, and presented her to her sorrowing friends—an act which "was known throughout all Joppa, and many believed in the Lord."

DRUSILLA, the daughter of Herod Agrippa, who was persuaded by Felix, procurator of Judea, to leave her husband, Azizus, king of Emesa, and to marry him, although he had then two wives. She was present when St Paul discoursed to Felix of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." Drusilla bore Felix one son, with whom she perished at an eruption of Mount Vesuvius in the reign of Titus.

E

EBED-MELECH, an Ethiopian eunuch at the court of Zedekiah, king of Judah, who, by the influence he possessed with that prince, procured the release of the Prophet Jeremiah from the dungeon into which he had been thrown by his enemies during the siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. He was preserved when the city was taken, according to the Divine promise, Jer. xxxix. 15. It appears from the short notice of Ebed-melech, that black eunuchs were employed in the courts of the Hebrew kings, as they still are in those of the Eastern sovereigns. They are brought when very young as slaves from Africa, and after being made eunuchs they are educated in the religion of their masters, of which they become very zealous professors. Their employment is about the king's female establishment, which they guard and superintend.

EDOM. See Esau.

EGLON, a very corpulent king of the Moabites who was insidiously slain by Ehud in the "summer-parlour" of his own residence at Jericho. During the reign of Eglon, who kept the Israelites in subjection, the Moabites seem to have recovered the strength they had lost in their wars with their kindred nation the

Amorites. Jericho, which Eglon made his chief residence, was in the territory of Benjamin, and that tribe would feel more keenly the severity of the Moabite's oppression. Hence it was natural to look for the next deliverer of the Israelites to belong to that tribe, and such was the case, for we find that when the Israelites had "served Eglon, the king of Moab, eighteen years," their repentance and humiliation caused their invisible King to raise them up a deliverer in the person of—

EHUD, the son of Gera, of the tribe of Benjamin. He was sent at the head of a deputation with a present to Eglon, and on that occasion he provided himself with a two-edged dagger, which he concealed in a cautious and proper manner. When the present was delivered he sent away the deputation, and returned to Eglon, to whom he said that he had a secret message to communicate, and all the persons in attendance were ordered to withdraw, while the king retired to his own private summer-parlour, followed by Ehud. The daring Benjamite, who, we are told, was *left-handed*—a peculiarity which distinguished the tribe of Benjamin—no sooner found Eglon at a sufficient distance from the hearing of his servants,

when he struck him a mortal wound in the belly. He then fastened the door of the apartment, and was allowed to depart unsuspected. After a considerable time had elapsed, during which they were astonished and alarmed at the silence of the king, they proceeded to the apartment and found Eglon dead. It is customary in the East for people to take a short sleep in the afternoon during the heat, and the servants of Eglon appear to have supposed that their master had locked himself up in the summer-parlour—an apartment detached from the main building, but having a communication with it, and also with the exterior—to enjoy his customary sleep, which to him was now the sleep of death. Meanwhile Ehud assembled the Israelites at Mount Ephraim, attacked the Moabites, slew ten thousand of them, and achieved their emancipation from those oppressors.

ELEAZAR, the son of Aaron, succeeded his father as the second high priest of the Jews not long before the entry of the Israelites into the Promised Land under Joshua. He was invested with the pontifical robes at Mount Hor, whither he had accompanied his father with his uncle Moses. There is nothing very remarkable recorded of Eleazar. He died a few years after Joshua, and was buried in a place belonging to Phinehas his son, in Mount Ephraim. There are many other persons of this name, which was very common among the Hebrews, mentioned by the sacred historians.

ELI, high priest of the Hebrews, is introduced to our notice in a very interesting manner. He was an old and venerable man when Samuel was a mere youth, and he appears as a good, pious, and indulgent father who was greatly tried by the wickedness and profligacy of his own sons, Hophni and Phinehas, which caused a severe malediction to be uttered against them and his family. Eli was a religious man himself, but of a too easy disposition to be judge over Israel, appointed to warn and punish the wicked. His two sons were slain in a battle with the Philistines, but this did not affect

him so much as the intelligence that the ark had also been taken in that disaster. As soon as the messenger intimated to him this melancholy occurrence he fell from his seat, and instantly died, B. C. 1141. The predictions against the family of this venerable high priest were afterwards literally fulfilled. See SAMUEL.

ELIAS. See ELIJAH.

ELIEZER, of Damascus, the name of Abraham's steward, the chief of his establishment, whom the Patriarch at one time intended to be his heir. He seems to have been a person of great trust and confidence, and was held in the highest esteem by his master. The Mahometans and others relate some traditions of Eliezer, which are altogether fanciful, and unworthy of credit.

ELIJAH, or ELIAS, the Prophet of Carmel on the Mediterranean, was one of the most illustrious messengers of Jehovah under the Mosaic Dispensation. He is called "the Tishbite, who was of the inhabitants of Gilead," and it is commonly thought that this describes Elijah as a native of the town of Tishbe in Galilee, which is mentioned in the Apocrypha as the birth-place of Tobit; but the Septuagint expresses it, "the Tishbite, from Tishbe of Gilead," an interpretation which corresponds with Josephus, who says that Elijah was a prophet of Thesbon, a country of Gilead.

This great Prophet lived during the reign of Ahab, king of Israel, and the sacred historian first introduces him to our notice as having announced to that idolatrous prince a long and parching drought, after which he was commanded by Jehovah to conceal himself near a winter torrent falling into the Jordan, called the brook Cherith. The precise locality of the Prophet's retreat from the persecutions of Ahab is not known, but the local traditions place it near a brook on the east of the Jordan, a few miles below the ford near Bethahan, where the surrounding district appears to have been always well-wooded, and caverns are formed on the sides of the hills. Here

the "ravens brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening, and he drank of the brook." This intimates that the ravens, harbouring in great numbers among the neighbouring woods, were directed by a controlling impulse from God to drop, or otherwise deposit, a portion of the food which they were conveying to their nests for their own offspring near the refuge of the Prophet. The raw meat he could easily dress with a fire of dry wood, while the water of the brook supplied him with that indispensable necessary.

While Elijah was sojourning in this retreat the brook dried up, and he was commanded to betake himself to Zarephath, the Sarepta of the New Testament, and to reside with a certain widow. As he came to the gate of the city he found the "widow woman," who appears to have been in the greatest poverty, gathering sticks. Elijah requested her to bring him a little water to quench his thirst, and as she was in the act of procuring it, he told her to bring also a "morsel of bread in her hand." The poor woman sorrowfully replied—"As the Lord thy God liveth, I have not a cake, but an handful of meal in a barrel, and a little oil in a cruse; and, behold, I am gathering two sticks, that I may go in and dress it for me and my son, that we may eat it, and die." But Elijah cheered her by the promises of Divine Providence—that Providence which had not sent him to be a burden to her in her necessities. "Fear not," he said, "go and do as thou hast said; but make me thereof a little cake first, and bring it unto me, and after make for thee and for thy son. For thus saith the Lord God of Israel, The barrel of meal shall not waste, neither shall the cruse of oil fail, until the day that the Lord sendeth rain upon the earth." The poor woman did as the Prophet instructed her. Though she resided beyond the bounds of the kingdom of Israel, she knew the name of the true God, and recognised Elijah to be a prophet, or at least one of His worshippers.

While the Prophet resided with this woman, which he did about a year, during which time the "barrel of meal wasted not, neither did the cruse of oil fail," according to the word of the Lord, her only son fell sick, and apparently died. Notwithstanding her poverty the feelings of maternal affection predominated, and in the anguish of her heart she addressed a kind of accusatory appeal to Elijah—"What have I to do with thee, O thou man of God? Art thou come unto me to call my sin to remembrance, and to slay my son?" He merely said to his widowed hostess, "Give me thy son;" and taking the child from her bosom, he carried him to an upper apartment of the house where he slept, and laid him on his own couch. He here addressed an earnest supplication to God, and stretched himself upon the child three times, saying, "O Lord my God, I pray thee let this child's soul come into him again." The prayer of this righteous man prevailed, and the child revived. Elijah took him in his arms, and brought him to his mother, saying, "See, thy child liveth." The grateful and overjoyed parent at once acknowledged the power of God and the divine commission of Elijah:—"Now by this I know," said she, "that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth." We are not to interpret these words as if the widow of Zarephath was now for the first time apprised that Elijah was a prophet of the true God. "She had sufficient reason," says Stackhouse, "to believe that Elijah was a prophet, or person sent from God, when she saw the miraculous increase of the meal and oil; it seems, however, that upon his not curing her sick son, so as to save his life, her faith began to droop, but upon seeing him brought to life her faith revived, and through the joy of having him restored to her again she accounted the latter miracle much greater than the former."

The drought and the famine had by this time become severe in Samaria, and Ahab began to be seriously alarmed for the consequences. In this extremity

he conferred with Obadiah, the chief steward of his household, who, we are told, "pleased the Lord greatly," and it was resolved to divide the kingdom between them in the search for water, and "Ahab went one way by himself, and Obadiah went another way by himself." While the king and his minister were in this exploratory expedition, Elijah was commanded by God, in the third year of the drought, to "go and show himself unto Ahab," and rain would be sent upon the earth. In obedience to this injunction Elijah left Zarephath, and on his way to the city of Samaria he met Obadiah, to whom he was well known. In the conversation which ensued the Prophet ordered his friend to return and announce to his master that he (Elijah) was present. To this Obadiah offered the strongest objections. He well knew that there was no one so odious to Ahab and his queen Jezebel as Elijah, to whom they ascribed all the miseries then afflicting the kingdom, and the diligent search they had both made for him to put him to death. He had also some fears for his own personal safety. "It shall come to pass," he said, "as soon as I am gone from thee, that the Spirit of the Lord shall carry thee whither I know not, and so when I come and tell Ahab, and he cannot find thee, he shall slay me; but I thy servant fear the Lord from my youth." It appears that he had been formerly impeached to Ahab for his religious conduct, as we find him adding—"Was it not told my lord what I did when Jezebel slew the Prophets of the Lord, how I hid an hundred men of the Lord's Prophets by fifty in a cave, and fed them with bread and water?" Elijah, however, assured him that he was at present acting in obedience to the command of Jehovah, and that he would most assuredly appear before Ahab that very day. Obadiah immediately followed after the king, who, when he was informed of the circumstance, turned to meet the Prophet.

The interview was characteristic of both parties. Ahab knew well his own

wickedness and the inflexible virtue of Elijah, yet he at once charged the Prophet with being the cause of all the misery which desolated the kingdom. "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" he exclaimed; which implies not merely a simple question, but a direct and positive accusation, uttered in a bold and threatening manner. There was no recognition of Elijah as a Prophet and messenger of God—no request that he would intercede with the great Jehovah, and entreat Him to refresh the parched earth by genial rain—and no acknowledgment of his own wicked career, with promises of amendment and indications of repentance. It is finely observed by an illustrious moralist that where there is shame there is still virtue—and that the man who thinks it incumbent upon him to apologise for his conduct is not yet beyond the hope of being desirous to reform his life: but Ahab, the weakest and the most idolatrous of all the kings of the Ten Tribes, entertained no such feelings, and he resolved to act on the offensive by at once assailing the Prophet. On the other hand, Elijah appeared before him in the most undaunted manner, as the commissioned ambassador of a superior power and a greater king—the Lord of Hosts. He did not make even the obeisance customary to be rendered by subjects to kings—he preserved the dignity of his office, and directly charged Ahab and his idolatrous family as the true authors of all the evils under which the nation groaned. "I have not troubled Israel," was the indignant retort, "but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim. Now, therefore, send and gather to me all Israel unto Mount Carmel, and the prophets of Baal four hundred and fifty, and the prophets of the groves four hundred, which eat at Jezebel's table." The number of those impostors maintained by Jezebel at her own expense shows how complete had been the apostacy of the Ten Tribes from God during the reign of Ahab, and the resolution of that wicked

and unprincipled queen to eradicate if possible every trace of the true religion in Ahab's kingdom, which she further attempted to prosecute by the persecution she excited against the prophets of Jehovah.

Ahab readily acquiesced with Elijah's proposal, and convened an immense assemblage of the people on Mount Carmel—that fine bold promontory on the south side of the bay of Acre in the Mediterranean—the town of Acre being at the northern point of the said bay. Properly Mount Carmel is a range of mountains which extend from north-west to south-east, but regarded apart, the promontory of the Mediterranean so designated, washed on its inland part by that “ancient river,” the river Kishon, which traverses the fine Plain of Esdraelon, rises to an elevation of 1500, or, as some state, 2000, feet above the level of the sea. Here the vast assemblage of the Ten Tribes congregated to witness one of the most remarkable transactions of antiquity—a transaction which has rendered the mountain sacred throughout all ages. The wide Mediterranean extended itself before them—that “Great Sea,” as the Hebrews termed it, explored by the vessels of the adventurous Phœnicians—behind them was their parched country, visited by the scourge of a long-continued drought, as a punishment for their ready compliance with their sovereign's idolatry, and above them a sultry sky, which for three years had not been obscured by a passing cloud, or moistened the ground with the genial dew.

The four hundred and fifty priests of Baal duly attended, but it appears that the prophets of the groves were either detained, or purposely kept back. When the multitude had assembled, and were waiting in anxious expectation to see what was to be done, Elijah addressed them in an animated manner. “How long,” he exclaimed to them in a loud voice, “halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him.” A solemn silence ensued, and the Prophet resumed—“I,

even I only, remain a Prophet of the Lord, but Baal's prophets are four hundred and fifty men. Let them, therefore, give us two bullocks; and let them choose one bullock for themselves, and cut it in pieces, and lay it on wood, and put no fire under; and I will dress the other bullock, and lay it on wood, and put no fire under: and call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord: and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God.” This proposition met with the approbation of all the people, who exclaimed, “It is well spoken,” or, as it is rendered in the marginal reading—“The word is good.”

It was an ancient and well known intimation of the Divine acceptance of a sacrifice if the wood, laid on the altar to consume it, took fire in a miraculous manner. Thus, Jehovah is supposed to have testified his acceptance of the sacrifices of Abel, Noah, and Abraham, and thus, at the dedication of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, there “came out fire from before the Lord, and consumed the burnt-offering.” Although Elijah on this memorable occasion was acting under the express command of God, the idea of a trial of power between adverse deities was not unknown in the ancient idolatrous systems, and this probably accounts for the ready acquiescence of the priests of Baal in the proposal, who seem to have been sincere enthusiasts. But the magnificent and convincing evidence of the power of Him who is “God of gods,” with which this transaction concludes, forms an interesting and instructive comparison with the paltry and miserable procedure which the contrivances of the heathen priests exhibited on such occasions.

The priests of Baal commenced their operations as Elijah directed, the Prophet conceding to them the first attempt on account of their numbers. They took a bullock, and dressed it, and they called on Baal to hear them from morning to noon. They leaped or danced about the altar, such exercises accompanying the

sacrifices and other acts of worship rendered to many of the ancient idols. The Prophet, who patiently witnessed the whole proceedings, began to expose their pretensions and practices in language of exquisite railery, and his taunts have a peculiar force when viewed with reference to the habits of Oriental countries, and the ideas entertained of their deities by the Pagans of ancient and modern times. "Cry aloud," he said, "for he is a god; either he is talking [so loud that he does not hear], or he is pursuing [hunting, or diverting himself], or he is in a journey [not at home—an admirable satire on his inattention to the prayers of his votaries], or peradventure he sleepeth [taking his *siesta*, or afternoon sleep, according to the custom of the East], and must be awaked." They continued to supplicate their deity, and they even cut themselves with knives and lancets—a barbarous custom common in the idolatrous rites of many nations, and still practised by miserable fanatics or designing impostors in Turkey, Persia, and several parts of India. The satire, altogether, is more pointed when we consider that it represents the deities as their worshippers believed them to be—namely, not only human in their amusements and pursuits, but many of them worse than human in their moral character and conduct—monsters of wickedness, depravity, and licentiousness—robbers, murderers, parricides, ravishers, adulterers, guilty of the most abominable crimes and the most revolting excesses.

The inspired historian informs us that "when mid-day was past, and they prophesied until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded." The unhappy enthusiasts had been allowed every advantage—the utmost patience had been exercised towards them, and no expressions of dissatisfaction at their failure had even escaped the spectators. It was now Elijah's turn, and he commenced by directing the people to approach much nearer to him, that they might be the more

thoroughly satisfied of the reality of what they were to witness. He "repaired the altar of the Lord which had been broken down," and he "took twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob," and "with the stones he built an altar in the name of the Lord." The altar here mentioned which Elijah repaired was the one erected on Mount Carmel in the times of the Judges, when such structures were permitted, because there was no fixed place of worship in any of the cantonments of the tribes; and in subsequent times we read of an altar on this celebrated promontory. There were present in this assembly only the subjects of Ahab, who was king of the Ten Tribes, yet Elijah took *twelve* stones to build the altar, to show that he was about to sacrifice in the name of all the race of Israel, and to mark out the conformity of religious worship which ought to prevail amongst them. Calmet appropriately observes that the general laws forbidding the erection of altars did not apply on the present occasion, since Elijah was acting under special direction, for the purpose of bringing back all Israel to the true worship of God.

The Prophet continued his preparations by making "a trench about the altar as capacious as would contain two measures of seed; and he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood." He then filled four barrels with water from the adjacent stream the Kishon, and poured it upon the sacrifice, which he repeated three several times, to prevent all suspicion that it could possibly be burnt by any common fire, and to make the miracle about to be wrought the more remarkable and convincing. The water ran from off the sacrifice, and filled the trench which surrounded the altar. It was about the time when the evening sacrifice was offered, and the holy seer stood before the altar in the presence of the wondering multitude, and of the priests of Baal. "Lord God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," he fervently exclaimed, "let it be known this day that thou art God

in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again." The Prophet had no sooner uttered this prayer than the heavens, as St James expresses it, which had previously been shut, were opened; the "fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt-sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench." A mighty dread pervaded the astonished Israelites at the sight of this stupendous miracle. They fell on their faces, and exclaimed, "The Lord, he is the God, the Lord, he is the God."

The unhappy priests of Baal were all put to death as impostors, blasphemers, and perverters of the Law, on the banks of the Kishon; and immediately after this extraordinary transaction, Elijah announced to Ahab the approach of rain. The seventh time his servant ascended to the summit of the promontory of Carmel he perceived rising, as if it were, from the farthest verge of the Mediterranean a "little cloud, like a man's hand." This small speck soon increased till the "heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain." A similar commencement of an Oriental storm is often noticed by travellers; and the expression is illustrated by the circumstance common in the East of the wind taking up such quantities of sand as darken the sky—a squall of wind of this description usually preceding rain. Dr Russell speaks of both as common at Aleppo, though this place is not in the immediate vicinity of any desert. Bruce informs us that "in Abyssinia the morning is often clear, and the sun shines; about noon a small cloud appears in the east, whirling violently round as if upon an axis; when arrived near the zenith, it first abates its motion, then loses its form, extends itself greatly, and seems to collect vapours from all opposite quarters. These clouds having attained nearly the same height, rush against each other with

great violence, and put me always in mind of Elijah foretelling rain on Mount Carmel."

Ahab proceeded to Jezreel, probably on account of its proximity to Carmel and Samaria, and to avoid being stopped by the rain. He there found his queen Jezebel, to whom he related the stupendous events he had witnessed. The exasperated princess immediately sent a messenger threatening Elijah with speedy vengeance.—"So let the gods do to me, and more also, if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to-morrow at this time." Elijah did not think it prudent to brave her resentment, and fled to Beersheba, which, being situated in the kingdom of Judah, secured him from her power. It was either on his journey thither, or on some other occasion, that he wandered into the wilderness, where he sat down under a juniper-tree, and requested that he might die. In the utmost despondency he exclaimed—"It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers." This expression intimates either that he had lived to their age, and was weary of the world's vanities, its sinfulness, and its opposition to the will of God; or that he could do no more good to the Israelites, stimulated in their idolatry by Ahab, than other prophets before him had done. On this occasion Elijah's firmness and confidence in the Divine protection seem to have forsaken him, and justify the observation of St James that "Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are." In this condition, while he lay sleeping, an angel touched him, and said to him, "Arise and eat." When he awoke, there was "a cake baken on the coals, and a cruse of water at his head." He refreshed himself and again lay down, but he was roused a second time by the miraculous and strengthening touch, and he was addressed—"Arise and eat, because the journey is too great for thee."

On this food the inspired historian informs us Elijah travelled forty days and forty nights, until he came to Horeb, the Mount of God, where Moses had been

favoured with extraordinary and stupendous manifestations of the Divine Presence. The direct distance from Beersheba to Horeb in the peninsula of Sinai is not above an hundred and fifty miles, which might be travelled by a person of ordinary strength at least in a week, and Elijah must therefore have proceeded by short stages, or taken a circuitous route. When he came to Horeb he took up his abode in a cave, probably the same which sheltered Moses, and in this desert solitude, surrounded by granite peaks and dreary mountains, occurred one of those displays of Divine power which may faintly be conceived, but which no language inferior to that of the inspired writer can adequately describe. A voice from the Divine Majesty once more spoke to mortal man in that rocky and almost tenantless wilderness, and the holy seer was asked, "What doest thou here, Elijah?" The Prophet, in reply, professed that he had not wanted zeal for the service of Jehovah, and that he had been moved with indignation against idolatry. "I have been very jealous," he said, "for the Lord God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away." The altars to which Elijah here alludes, as having been thrown down by the idolatrous Israelites, had no reference to Jerusalem, which then flourished under the good king Jehoshaphat, but to those in the territory of the Ten Tribes, erected by the Patriarchs and other holy men before the foundation of the Temple of Jerusalem. At Ramah, Mizpeh, Gilgal, and Mount Carmel, there was one of those altars, and there might be more at other places. On these the pious persons of the Ten Tribes offered their sacrifices when they were no longer permitted to resort to Jerusalem. Jeroboam first introduced the prohibition by setting up the golden calves, and Ahab had not deprived them of the last remaining memorials of their religion.

The Prophet was directed to "go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord," and here occurred the grand manifestation previously noticed, which the inspired historian describes in language truly sublime. "Behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountain, and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord, but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a still small voice." When Elijah heard it he covered his face with his mantle, and stood at the entrance of the cave. Here the "still small voice" again addressed him—"What doest thou here, Elijah?" He repeated his former answer, and he now received the Divine instructions. He was told to return on his way to the Wilderness of Damascus, where he was to anoint Hazael to be king of Syria—he was also to perform the same ceremony to Jehu, the son of Nimshi, as king of Israel—and Elisha, the son of Shaphat of Abel-Meholah, was to be commissioned by him to be his own successor in the prophetic office. Probably the *anointing* here mentioned means no more than the announcement of the Divine appointment, and in the case of Jehu we know that Elijah did not do it in person, but ordered it to be performed by his successor Elisha. Such were the important changes about to take place that the purposes of God might be accomplished, and punishment inflicted by human agency on the guilty. Elijah was also corrected in his mistake, in imagining that he was the only worshipper of the true God remaining in Israel. "I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him."

Elijah returned from the holy mount to fulfil the Divine intimations, and in his way he found Elisha, who "ministered unto him." A few years after this occurred the affair of Naboth the Jezreelite, on whose paternal inheritance Ahab set his

covetous eyes, and who was barbarously put to death on a false charge of blasphemy, by the contrivance of Jezebel. For this atrocious crime, which appears to have been perpetrated at least with the tacit acquiescence of Ahab, Elijah was sent with an appalling message to that guilty monarch and his infamous queen. The righteous denunciations of Heaven made some impression even on Ahab. He "humbled himself," and his transient repentance procured a partial remittance of the punishment against himself individually, but extending it to his son. As it respected Jezebel there was no alteration of the Divine decree—"The dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel."

The next transaction in which Elijah is introduced to our notice is connected with Ahab's son and successor Ahaziah, who, having met with an accident in his palace, had fallen dangerously ill, and sent messengers to inquire of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, if he would recover. Elijah met this deputation on their way, and told them to return to their master and inform him that he would not recover. Ahaziah sent two several military parties to seize the Prophet by force, who were destroyed by fire from heaven for their rudeness and violence. The seer accompanied the third party, and was introduced to the king, to whom he announced—"Thus saith the Lord, Forasmuch as thou hast sent messengers to inquire of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, is it not because there is no God in Israel to inquire of his word? therefore thou shalt not come down off that bed on which thou art gone up, but shalt surely die."

We now come to the close of this illustrious Prophet's career on earth, and his bodily assumption into heaven. The inspired historian informs us that "when the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven," he went with Elisha from Gilgal. On the way Elijah said to his successor, as if to try him, for he did not intimate that there would be no witnesses of it, "Tarry here, I pray thee, for the

Lord hath sent me to Bethel;" but Elisha answered, "As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." They both proceeded to Bethel, where they were met by the members of the prophetic school there, who said to Elisha, "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?" Elisha replied, "Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace." Here Elijah said to him, "Elisha, tarry here, I pray thee, for the Lord hath sent me to Jericho," but he positively refused to leave him, and a similar conversation occurred between Elisha and the sons of the prophets. Again Elijah said to him, "Tarry, I pray thee, here, for the Lord hath sent me to Jordan," and once more Elisha solemnly refused to leave him. The two seers proceeded together towards the Jordan, while fifty of the young prophetic scholars of Jericho watched their proceedings at a distance. When they came to the banks of the river Elijah took his mantle—a robe made of skins, supposed to have been an upper garment thrown over the shoulders and reaching down to the heels—and "smote the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, so that they two went over on dry ground." As soon as they reached the other side of the river Elijah said to his companion, "Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken away from thee." Elisha replied—"I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me"—a request which the good Bishop Hall thus paraphrases—"As thou hast chosen me to stand in a nearer relation to thee than the rest of the sons of the prophets, so give me this prerogative that I may have a double portion to them of that spirit and those powers which are in thee." Elijah replied, "Thou hast asked me a hard thing; nevertheless, if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee, but if not, it shall not be so." While they were thus conversing, and walking onwards, there appeared a chariot and horses, as if of fire, which separated them, Elijah being taken in human and bodily form, without tasting death, into heaven

by a whirlwind. When Elisha saw this great and wonderful termination of Elijah's prophetic office, he uttered the fine expression, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." The mantle of the illustrious Tishbite, the mighty seer of Carmel, fell upon him, and Elisha saw Elijah no more. Such was the conclusion of Elijah's ministry, and thus, in three several ages of the world, we have three remarkable characteristics of the several dispensations—the translation of Enoch in the times before the Flood, of Elijah under the Law, and the resurrection and ascension of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ under the Gospel—the glad tidings of which were to eradicate every species of idolatrous superstition, and to cheer by their benignant influence the spiritual Israel of God, of whom the temporal Israel were typical. "There are," says Bishop Hall, "three bodily inhabitants of heaven—Enoch, Elijah, and our Saviour Christ—the first before the Law, the second under the Law, the third under the Gospel—all three in a several form of translation. Our blessed Saviour raised himself to and above the heavens by his own immediate power: He ascended as the Son, they as servants: He as God, they as creatures. Elijah ascended by the visible ministry of angels, Enoch insensibly. Wherefore, O God, hast thou done this, but to give us a taste of what we shall be—to let us see that heaven was never shut to the faithful—to give us an assurance of the future glorification of this mortal and incorruptible part? Even thus, O Saviour, when thou shalt descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, we that are alive and remain shall be caught up together, with the raised bodies of thy saints, into the clouds, to meet thee in the air, and to dwell with thee in glory."

It would be almost inexcusable to weaken these beautiful observations by any allusions to the Rabbinical and other traditions respecting this Prophet. It is

not a little remarkable that nothing is known of the parentage or birth of Elijah, and even his country is a subject of dispute. At Carmel, however, the scene of his stupendous miracle, his memory is still preserved; and there are spots pointed out which, from their supposed connection with his history, are visited by Jews, Christians, and Mahometans, with great veneration. Among these localities are shown the grotto in which he is said to have lodged—another in which he instructed the "sons of the prophets"—a fountain produced by a miracle to supply him with water—his garden, where certain stones are supposed to be petrified fruits—the spot where he offered sacrifices—and the place near the Kishon where the priests of Baal were slain. "The spot," says Mr Carne, "was finely chosen by the Prophet for the spectacle of his sacrifice, since the multitude of people coming from the regions of Samaria might stand with perfect convenience in the splendid and open area of Esdraelon, which is here terminated at the foot of Carmel. The declivity of the mountain, its brink dark with woods, and its sides covered with the richest pasture, looks over a vast extent of country on every side; from the hills of Samaria, Cana, and Gilboa, the miracle might have been beheld; and to the eager gaze of the Israelites in the plain, the prophets of Baal, their useless altars, and the avenging messenger of God, were as distinct as if the scene had been acted at their feet."

ELISHA, or ELISEUS, the successor of Elijah, was the son of Shaphat of Abel-Meholah. Elijah when at Horeb was commissioned by God to nominate him his successor, and when he found him he was "ploughing with twelve yoke of oxen before him, and he with the twelfth, and Elijah passed him, and cast his mantle upon him." Elisha instantly left his avocation, and ran after Elijah, exclaiming, "Let me, I pray thee, kiss my father and my mother, and then I will follow thee." The Prophet replied, "Go back again, for what have I done unto thee?" Shortly

afterwards he "went after Elijah, and ministered unto him."

Elisha was present when his great predecessor was taken into heaven, on which occasion "he took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces." He also took up the mantle of Elijah which fell from him, and returned to the banks of the Jordan, where with the mysterious garment he divided the waters, exclaiming, "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?" The more forcible and expressive translation of the Hebrew is—"Where is the God of Elijah? Surely He is," or, "is still the same"—thus earnestly beseeching God to assist him with his power, as he had formerly assisted Elijah. The Prophet passed over the channel of the river, and proceeded towards Jericho. The whole transaction took place in sight of the fifty "sons of the prophets," who were watching narrowly at a distance. They at once perceived that the spirit of the mighty seer of Carmel "rested on Elisha," and they rendered him due obeisance when he approached. Being imperfectly acquainted with the nature of Elijah's translation, they imagined that he might be taken away only for a time, or that his body might be left upon some neighbouring mountain, or in some valley. They proposed to Elisha—"Behold now, there be with thy servants fifty strong men: let them go, we pray thee, and seek thy master, lest peradventure the Spirit of the Lord hath taken him up, and cast him upon some mountain, or into some valley." Elisha at first opposed this request, but they urged him so long and so anxiously that he was forced to comply, lest it might appear as if he were wanting in love and reverence towards his great predecessor's memory. They set out in their search, and, after exploring the neighbouring hills and valleys for three days, they were obliged to return to Jericho.

At this city Elisha wrought his first miracle after entering on the prophetic office. The inhabitants represented to him that though the city was pleasantly

situated, the water was bad, and the ground barren. The Prophet told them to bring to him a "new cruse, with salt therein." This being done, he proceeded to the spring which supplied the city with water, and cast the salt into it, adding, "Thus saith the Lord, I have healed these waters; there shall not be from thence any more death or barren land." The miracle was complete, and the inspired historian informs us that "the waters were healed unto this day, according to the saying of Elisha which he spake." Maundrell gives us an excellent description of what is now usually considered to be the fountain sweetened by the Prophet. "Turning into the plain," he says, "we passed by a ruined aqueduct, and a convent in the same condition, and in about a mile's riding came to the Fountain of Elisha, so called because miraculously purged of its brackishness by that Prophet at the request of the men of Jericho. Its waters are at present received in a basin about nine or ten paces long and five or six broad, and from thence issuing out in good plenty, divide themselves into several small streams, dispersing their refreshment between this [the place where our traveller then was] and Jericho, and rendering it exceedingly fruitful." This is one of the most interesting notices of the localities of sacred antiquity on record.

Elisha soon afterwards left Jericho, on the inhabitants of which he had conferred this most invaluable benefit, and proceeded to Mount Carmel, celebrated in the history of his distinguished master, and on his way thither a very remarkable incident occurred. Bethel, it will be remembered, was one of the cities where the golden calf was worshipped, its inhabitants were peculiarly addicted to idolatry, and held in contempt all those prophets who reproved them for their flagrant vices. Elisha passed this city in his way, and no sooner was he recognised than he was assailed by a number of profane young men, designated "little children" in our version—an expression often applied in the Scriptures to young

but full grown men. They came out and mocked him, saying, "Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head." The phrase *go up* was employed in derision of that great act of the power of God—the translation of Elijah, abusively telling Elisha to "go up" after his master, while the epithet *bald head* was personally most insulting, because it intimated that sort of baldness on the back part of the head which the Orientals consider most ignominious. The indignant Prophet turned round when he heard them assailing him in this insulting and unprovoked manner, and in his prophetic character he "cursed them in the name of the Lord." In the case of those profane youths of Bethel, the wicked were literally "overtaken in their own wickedness." We are told that "there came forth two she-bears out of the wood, and tare forty and two of them." This grievous and summary punishment was a proper rebuke to the people of Bethel for their irreverence and insult upon a prophet of God, and therein upon God himself. "They might derive from it instruction," observes Dr Waterland, "to train up their children in future to good manners and to the fear of God, and for the present they might see how God detests scoffers and mockers, and what reverence he expected to be paid to his commissioned prophets."

Elisha proceeded from Mount Carmel to Samaria, but nothing is recorded of him till the following year, B.C. 895, when war was declared by Jehoram, king of Israel, against Mesha, king of Moab, who had embraced the opportunity of Ahab's death to revolt. Jehoram persuaded Jehoshaphat to assist him in subduing the refractory Moabites, and both kings took the field, accompanied by the "king of the Edomites," as the viceroy appointed by Jehoshaphat is designated, 1 Kings xxii. 47. After a march of seven days the united army began to be in great distress for want of water, and Jehoram was afraid lest the Moabites might attack and route them in their distressing situation. Jehosha-

phat asked if there was a prophet of the Lord near, that they might "inquire of the Lord by him." An officer of the king of Israel said, "Here is Elisha, the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah." The king of Judah observed that the "word of the Lord was with him," for he knew Elisha well, and the two kings, with the Hebrew viceroy of the tributary Edomites, proceeded to consult the Prophet.

It does not appear where Elisha was on this occasion—whether he followed the army, or was then at no great distance from the encampment. It is simply said that "the king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat, and the king of Edom, *went down* to him." The notice that Elisha *poured water on the hands of Elijah* sufficiently indicates the relation in which he stood to his great master. This was the established duty of an attendant or disciple. This notice also intimates that the Hebrews were accustomed to wash their hands in the manner at present universal in the East, and which is said to be more refreshing and cleanly than washing in the water in a basin—a process greatly disliked by the Orientals. The ewer employed in the East for this purpose is usually of tinned copper, having a long spout, and a long covered narrow neck, with a sufficient handle, and the vessel is not unlike our fancy coffee-pots in general appearance. It is set in a basin of the same material, which has commonly a sort of cover rising in the middle and sunk into the basin at the margin, and as this is pierced with holes, it allows the water to pass through concealed after it has been soiled by use. The hands are held over this basin, and the water—usually tepid, especially after a meal, to clean the grease contracted by eating with the hands, as no knives and forks are in use—is poured upon them from the ewer held above. After this process of washing is over no towel or cloth is offered, and every one dries his hands as he pleases. It is evident that this mode of cleansing cannot be conveniently managed without the as-

sistance of an attendant, who always approaches with the ewer in his right hand and the basin in his left; and if the person has no servant or attendant, he asks a bystander to pour the water upon his hands, and offers a return of the obligation. These remarks not only explain the situation of Elisha, after he left his avocation at the plough, and "ministered" to Elijah, but also the similar intimations both in the Old and New Testament writings.

When Jehoram and his allies waited on Elisha, the Prophet said to him, "What have I to do with thee? Get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother." The king of Israel replied, "Nay, for the Lord hath called these [or *us*] three kings together, to deliver them into the hand of Moab:"—an answer which is thus explained by Bishop Hall—"However I may have deserved to be disregarded in this suit, yet have pity on these other princes who are joined with me; let us not, for the mere want of water, be delivered into the hand of Moab." Elisha said, "As the Lord of hosts liveth, before whom I stand, surely were it not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, I would not look toward thee, nor see thee. But now bring me a minstrel." The indignation of the Prophet was roused by Jehoram's behaviour, and especially by his daring expressions; he was agitated, vexed, and mortified at what he saw, and thus uneasy and bewildered, he felt himself unfit for supplication to God, or for receiving communication from Him. To acquire his wonted self-possession the Prophet had recourse to the tranquillizing power of music—of those holy melodies which recal the wandering thoughts, cause the agitated passions and feelings to subside, and fix them on that object the most interesting to devout contemplation. "It was not for their ears," observes Bishop Hall; "it was for his own bosom that Elijah called for music, that his mind after its zealous agitation might be sweetly composed, and put into a meet temper

for receiving the calm visions of God. Perhaps it was some holy Levite following the camp of Jehoshaphat whose minstrelsy was required for so sacred a purpose. None but a quiet breast is capable of divine revelation, and nothing is more powerful to settle a troubled heart than melodious harmony."

While the minstrel played, the Prophet was soothed by the holy strains, and "the hand of the Lord came upon him." He then announced to his anxious inquirers the Divine communication:—"Thus saith the Lord, Make this valley full of ditches. For thus saith the Lord, Ye shall not see wind, neither shall ye see rain, yet that valley shall be filled with water, that ye may drink, both ye, and your cattle, and your beasts. And this is but a light thing in the hand of the Lord; he will deliver the Moabites into your hand. And ye shall smite every fenced city, and every choice city, and shall fell every good tree, and stop all wells of water, and mar every good piece of land with stones." This announcement was duly verified, and the Moabites were completely defeated. Although the phrase *to see wind* may appear singular to us, the description is most appropriate in the Oriental deserts, where the presence of wind is painfully manifested to the eye during a dry season by the vast quantities of dust whirled into the air, which they often greatly darken. *To fell every good tree* is a mode of distressing an enemy still practised in those countries. The nomade Arabs of Palestine make war on each other by burning the corn, cutting down the olive trees, carrying off the sheep and cattle, and doing all possible damage in this way. In such regions the *stopping of wells of water*, namely, filling them up, or destroying them, requires no illustration. The calamity can be easily appreciated.

The next transaction of Elisha was his multiplying a widow's oil. This woman, whose name is not given, had been the wife of one of the sons of the prophets, and she came to Elisha, saying, "Thy servant my husband is dead, and thou

knowest that thy servant did fear the Lord, and the creditor is come to take unto him my two sons." To understand this it is necessary to notice, that by the Jewish Law children were held as the proper goods of their parents, who had power to sell them for seven years, as their creditors had to compel them to pay their debts; and it is said that from the Hebrews this custom was extended among the Athenians, and from them again to the Romans. It appears a harsh and unreasonable enactment that the children of a poor man, left without any patrimony whatever, should be compelled into slavery, to pay their deceased father's debts; yet this was the authorised custom, and Elisha does not reprove the creditors, but he suggests a method to the woman to pay them. He asked her, "What shall I do for thee? Tell me what thou hast in the house?" She answered, "Thine handmaid hath not any thing in the house save a pot of oil." Elisha said, "Go, borrow thee vessels abroad of all thy neighbours, even empty vessels; borrow not a few: and when thou art come in thou shalt shut the door upon thee and upon thy sons, and shalt pour out into all these vessels, and thou shalt set aside that which is full." She hastened to obey the Prophet's instructions, and after borrowing all the vessels she possibly could, she commenced filling them with the miraculously increased oil, after which it ceased to multiply, and the "oil stayed." She informed Elisha of what she had done, and he said to her, "Go, sell the oil, and pay thy debt, and live thou and thy children of the rest." Such is the simple and beautiful story recorded for our instruction, to show that Jehovah regardeth the widow and the fatherless—that faith and confidence in Him will never be misplaced—and that He is able to rescue from the lowest depression, the greatest difficulties, and the most abject poverty.

The life of Elisha is marked by a series of beautiful narratives, combining the most interesting illustrations of benevolence. Of gentler disposition than

his distinguished master, the stern Prophet of Carmel, or at least not placed in such trying circumstances, he was commissioned to exhibit numerous acts of the Divine philanthropy, and to show the goodness of God, that the degenerate Israelites might be induced to return to their allegiance to their heavenly Sovereign. To reward the virtuous, and to denounce the wicked, formed indeed a part of the office of every prophet under the Law, but the mission of Elisha appears to have been milder than that of Elijah, who had to contend with the vices and crimes of Ahab, the impieties of Jezebel, and the idolatries of Baal. His acquaintance was more extensive, or he entered more into the socialities of personal friendship, than the great avenger of Divine wrath on wanton apostacy and superstition; and in many of the actions of his life he is introduced as the kind rewarder of piety, and the welcome messenger of good tidings. In no case is this more exemplified than in that of the good Shunammite. He often went to or passed through Shunam, a city of the tribe of Issachar, where this excellent female resided, who is noticed as a "great woman," or one in good circumstances, and possessed of considerable wealth. How the intimacy commenced is not recorded, but he was at all times a welcome guest; and, to quote the expressive language of the inspired historian, "so it was that as oft as he passed by he turned in thither to eat bread." On one of those occasions, after the Prophet had taken leave of this kind and hospitable woman, she said to her husband, "Behold now, I perceive that this is an holy man of God, who passeth by us continually; let us make a little chamber, I pray thee, on the wall, and let us set for him there a bed, and a table, and a stool, and a candlestick, and it shall be when he cometh to us that he shall turn in thither." The kindness of the female disposition, in attending to the comforts of the "holy man of God," is strongly depicted in this disinterested proposal, which met with the cordial assent

of her husband. Like the gentle Lydia of the New Testament, the good Shunammite of the Old thought herself honoured by having the commissioned Prophet of God under her roof, and she wished to diminish the fatigue attending his vocation by providing for his comfort in her own dwelling. She was to make "a little chamber on the wall"—a private room remote from the inhabited part of the house, to which Elisha could retire, and without disturbance indulge in prayer and meditation. The chamber was already made, but it was to be arranged, and kept in constant readiness exclusively for him. When the Prophet next experienced the hospitality of the Shunammite, he occupied the apartment thus prepared for his reception. Grateful for her kindness, he ordered his servant Gehazi to ask her to attend him, and to say, "Behold, thou hast been careful for us with all this care, what is to be done for thee? wouldest thou be spoken for to the king, or to the captain of the host?" She answered that she "dwelt among her own people," intimating that she was content with what she possessed, and had no wish beyond the quiet retirement she enjoyed. "What then is to be done for her?" inquired the Prophet of Gehazi. The latter replied, "Verily she hath no child, and her husband is old." Elisha told him to call her, and when she appeared the Prophet told her that in due season she would have a son. Overjoyed at the announcement that she would yet become a parent, but doubting the welcome intelligence, she besought him to be sincere, and was solemnly assured that she would "embrace a son"—that the feelings of maternal affection would swell her generous bosom—and that God would thus reward her for her kindness to his servant. In due time the promised son was born, and grew up the delight and the comfort of his virtuous parents. Thus glided his years of infancy and youth, carefully watched by the Prophet at his stated visits to Shunam, until on one occasion, when with his father, who was with his reapers,

he exclaimed, "My head, my head!" This was what is called a *stroke of the sun*, which often fatally terminates shortly after it occurs, and that the sun of Palestine is strong enough to produce this effect is asserted by several travellers, particularly in the plains, such as those of Jericho and Esdraelon, in the borders of the latter of which Shunam was situated. The distressed father ordered one of his servants to carry his son to his mother, and the good Shunammite nursed him on her knees till noon, when he died. She then took him to Elisha's apartment, and laid him on the Prophet's couch, carefully shutting or securing the door. It was now that her faith was conspicuous, and afforded her consolation amid her sorrowful bereavement. Elisha was then at Mount Carmel, which appears to have been his principal residence, and thither the Shunammite resolved to proceed. She said to her husband, "Send me, I pray thee, one of the young men, and one of the asses, that I may run to the man of God, and come again." He replied, "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor sabbath." It ought to be here observed, that the prophets were the public instructors of the people, who resorted to their houses on the days mentioned to be taught their duty from the Law, and to hear its doubtful points explained. As it was neither "new moon nor sabbath," the husband of the Shunammite could not perceive the object of his wife in resorting to Elisha at such a distance, and she appears to have concealed, from prudential motives, the real cause of her journey. She simply answered that it would be well, and the ass was saddled according to her directions. She urged her attendant to make all possible haste. "Drive, and go forward; slack not thy riding for me, except I bid thee." This also requires some explanation. It was the ancient as it still is the modern custom in the East, when a female rides, for a servant to follow on foot, and to *drive*, as the expression is, and not *lead* the animal. Women usually ride on

asses, and their attendants—always on foot—drive or goad the animal forward at such a pace as the ladies may require. If the lady happen to be of high rank, sometimes a man goes before the ass to lead it, and another is behind to urge it forward; but while the leader may be, and often is, dispensed with, it is seldom so with the driver. In this way the Shunammite proceeded to Carmel, and when she was some distance from the mountain she was recognised by Elisha, who ordered Gehazi to go and meet her, and inquire after herself, her husband, and her child. To all the several questions of the Prophet's attendant she answered in a general manner, choosing rather to communicate her distress to his master. When she arrived at Mount Carmel, and was in the presence of Elisha, she sunk to the ground, and caught him by his feet in an agony of mental despair mixed with confidence and hope. Gehazi would have removed her, but his master said, "Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her, and the Lord hath hid it from me, and hath not told me." She simply said to Elisha, "Did I desire a son, my lord? Did I not say, Do not deceive me?" At once the Prophet comprehended what had happened—he saw the grief of the parent and the motive which induced her to apply to him, and under the Divine guidance he resolved to return with the Shunammite. He ordered Gehazi to set out before them, strictly enjoining upon him the utmost expedition, and to lose no time in observing the long and formal salutations to and from strangers when they meet, peculiar in the East:—"Gird up thy loins, and take my staff in thine hand, and go thy way; if thou meet any man, salute him not, and if any salute thee, answer him not again: and lay my staff upon the face of the child." The Shunammite then said, "As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." While they were on the way they were met by Gehazi, who informed Elisha that he had obeyed his instructions, and laid the staff upon the face of the lad, but that it had

no effect—"the child had not awaked." Interpreters are divided in opinion respecting the cause of this failure. Some ascribe the fault to Gehazi, who, they allege, did not accurately follow Elisha's commands; others conjecture that it was occasioned by a want of faith in the Shunammite, evinced in her determination not to leave the Prophet; and others, again, suppose that the Prophet sent Gehazi to attempt the recovery of the youth entirely from his own suggestion, and not moved by the Spirit of God. These, however, are fanciful and even frivolous conjectures, scarcely warranted by the text. When Elisha came to Shunam, and entered the house of his friends, he proceeded to his own apartment, and found the lad stretched dead on his couch. He shut the door, and "prayed unto the Lord." He then "lay upon the child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands, and he stretched himself upon the child, and the flesh of the child waxed warm." He repeated this after a suitable interval, when "the child sneezed seven times, and opened his eyes." Thus restored, the Shunammite was summoned, and her son was delivered to her. In ardent gratitude she fell at Elisha's feet, and "bowed herself to the ground, and took up her son, and went out."

Nearly four years after this transaction there was a great dearth throughout Israel, and Elisha came to Gilgal, where he met the *sons of the prophets*. He ordered Gehazi to prepare that peculiar kind of food rendered *pottage* for those persons. It happened that "one went out into the field to gather herbs, and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild gourds his lap full, and came and shred them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not." The *wild gourd* or *vine* here mentioned (literally *vine of the field*) was perhaps the *colocynth*, called a wild vine from the shape of its leaves, and the climbing nature of its stem. It is noted for its bitter taste and its violent purgative qualities—it being

poisonous, if not qualified and taken in a moderate quantity. It was at once perceived, when the pottage was tasted, that there was some poisonous herb in it, and the "sons of the prophets" exclaimed to Elisha, "O man of God, there is death in the pot." He ordered meal or flour to be thrown into it, which deprived it of its distasteful quality, and assuaged the alarm of those who were partakers of it; but this addition of flour, commanded by the Prophet, was merely a continuation of the process, and the change must be ascribed solely to the power of God.

Again we find him enabled by Divine Wisdom to multiply bread to his disciples in a remarkable manner. A man from Baal-shalisha brought him "bread of the first fruits," twenty loaves of barley, and full ears of corn, which he ordered to be given to the people for a repast. Gehazi said, "What, should I set this before an hundred men?" But the limited quantity of the provision was only to exhibit in a striking manner the sovereign power and goodness of Jehovah. "Give unto the people," said the Prophet, "that they may eat; for thus saith the Lord, They shall eat, and shall leave thereof." The provision was set before them, and "they did eat, and left thereof, according to the word of the Lord."

About this time occurred the extraordinary cure of Naaman from leprosy by washing in the river Jordan seven times, which was followed by the transference of that dreadful distemper to Gehazi for his falsehood, deception, and covetousness. The Prophet had beheld the wealth, which the gratitude of the Syrian prompted him to offer, with the utmost indifference; but the wretched Gehazi could not resist the temptation, and by a false tale in the name of his master easily appropriated to himself, as a willing gift from Naaman, a part of the silver and the raiment intended for Elisha. The punishment of this individual teaches us a most important and salutary lesson, and shows us the force of St Paul's exhortation, *to beware of covetousness, which is*

In the war which broke out shortly after the return of Naaman between the kings of Israel and Syria, the latter was grievously perplexed when he found that his most secret designs were communicated to the king of Israel. Elisha was informed by Jehovah of every movement of the Syrians, of which he gave due notice to his own sovereign, who acted upon it on several occasions with great advantage to himself. The Syrian king accused his advisers of treachery, and told them to confess at once how many of them were in the interest of the king of Israel. The reply was—"None, my lord, O king: but Elisha the Prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber." On this statement Bishop Patrick makes some very appropriate observations:—"It is probable that Naaman, on his return from Samaria, spread the fame of Elisha so much in the court of Syria, that some of the great men might have the curiosity to make further inquiries respecting him; and hearing of several of his miraculous works, they might thence conclude that he could tell the greatest secrets as well as perform such wonders as were related of him, and that, therefore, in all probability he was the person who gave the king of Israel intelligence of all the schemes which had been contrived to entrap him." Benhadad believed the statement, and resolved to get Elisha into his power. Hearing that he was at Dothan in the tribe of Manasseh, not far from Samaria, he sent a strong force to take him prisoner and bring him to Damascus. The town of Dothan was surrounded by night, and escape was to all human appearance impossible. When Elisha's servant, who had risen early in the morning, discovered the city completely encompassed by a considerable army, he was at no loss to conjecture the motive. He informed the Prophet, and exclaimed, in a tone of despair, "Alas, my master, how shall we do?" But Elisha replied, "Fear not, for they that be with us are more than they that be with them;" and at the

prayer of the Prophet the "eyes" of the servant were "opened," and "behold the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." The Syrian soldiers were smitten with blindness, and were unconsciously led by the Prophet to the city of Samaria. Jehoram was inclined to put them all to the sword, but he was prevented by this generous and noble-minded man of God, who caused them to be hospitably treated, and to be dismissed in peace to their own master.

In the dreadful famine which immediately followed this transaction at Samaria, when that city was also sustaining a severe siege by the Syrians, Jehoram vowed bitter vengeance against Elisha for not, as he supposed, averting the calamity by his prayers and intercessions with God. The revolting recital of the woman who had been compelled by hunger to eat her own son filled the king with grief and horror, and he declared, "God do so and more also to me, if the head of Elisha, the son of Shaphat, shall stand on him this day." He sent a messenger to execute his bloody purpose, and before he arrived Elisha said to his friends who were assembled with him, "See ye how this son of a murderer [Ahab] hath sent to take away mine head? look, when the messenger cometh, shut the door, and hold him fast at the door: is not the sound of his master's feet behind him?" He had scarcely spoken when the messenger appeared. But Elisha was enabled to announce to the famishing citizens an abundant supply of provisions on the following day, while he at the same time intimated the fate of one of the king's attendants who had dared to doubt or dispute the fact—the people "trode upon him in the gate, and he died, as the man of God had said, who spake when the king came to him." The city of Samaria was also most miraculously relieved by the flight of the Syrians, who, in their panic, "left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life."

On the following year, B.C. 891, a severe famine commenced, which continued seven years. Elisha, who had always maintained his friendly intercourse with the hospitable Shunammite, warned her of the approaching season of scarcity, advised her to proceed with her household beyond its reach, and there to sojourn until it was ended. She retired to the country of the Philistines, where she resided all the time it continued, and during her absence she was deprived of her whole property. From this circumstance it appears that the estates of those who left the country were confiscated to the king, although some think that the next of kin had seized the Shunammite's lands, and others that her agent had been unfaithful. As it respects the first conjecture, there is nothing concerning it in the Law of Moses; but, after the establishment of the regal government, the kings might find that, as confiscation was the only process by which they could obtain property, it was their policy to fix this penalty as the punishment of certain offences, or the consequence of certain measures, of which absence in a foreign country beyond a given time, or without leave, might be one. No such law, however, existed before the time of the Kings, as we see exemplified in the Book of Ruth. When the Shunammite returned, and found her property confiscated, she appealed to the king for justice. It happened that Jehoram was conversing with Gehazi, who was informing him of "all the great things that Elisha had done," and "how he had restored a dead body to life," when the Shunammite appeared, "crying to the king for her house and for her land." Gehazi, who knew her well, instantly observed to the king, "My lord, O king, this is the woman, and this is her son, whom Elisha restored to life." Jehoram inquired into all the circumstances, and was so impressed with her narrative, that he ordered "all that was hers, and all the fruits of the field since the day that she left the land even until now," to be restored to her and her family.

In the year B.C. 885, Elisha proceeded to Damascus. Benhadad the king was then dangerously ill, and when he heard of the Prophet's arrival he sent Hazael with a magnificent present, of forty camels' burden, to inquire if he would recover. The remarkable interview which took place between Hazael and the Prophet is finely narrated by the inspired historian; the former, notwithstanding all his protestations, acted as Elisha intimated he would do. He murdered his sovereign, became king of Syria, and a bitter enemy of the Israelites.

The next transaction of Elisha was the anointing of Jehu to be king of Israel, which he ordered to be done by one of the young prophets. When he is again mentioned, he "was fallen sick of the sickness whereof he died." In this condition he was visited by Joash, king of Israel, who wept over his face, saying, "O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof." This expression, it will be recollected, was first used by Elisha when Elijah was taken up into heaven, and might then be supposed to refer to that event, but its repetition here evidently intimates that the phrase had now become proverbial, and applicable to one who was considered the defender of his country, although it may have originated at Elijah's assumption. At length, "Elisha died, and they buried him," and Josephus assures us that the body of the Prophet was very honourably interred. Some time afterwards a most remarkable incident occurred at the place of Elisha's burial. It is not stated precisely when the circumstance happened, some concluding that it was the following year, and others that a number of years intervened. The inspired historian informs us that "the bands of the Moabites invaded the land, at the coming in of the year. And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that behold they espied a body of men; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his

feet." The body of the Prophet was, in unison with the ancient custom in the East, and especially in Judea, deposited in a cave within a field or garden, and the bearers, when conveying this corpse to its own proper sepulchre, of a similar construction, were alarmed at the appearance of a hostile band of the Moabites, and placed their burden in Elisha's sepulchre, which was close at hand. This they could easily do by removing the stone which protected the entrance to the cave. The miracle here recorded likewise intimates that neither the corpse of the Prophet nor of the man was enclosed in a coffin. In the East dead bodies, whether designed to be deposited in a cave or interred in a grave, were for the most part merely swathed; and in the present case it is clear that the man was swathed in such a manner as not to prevent him from getting up on his feet when life returned. This miracle, as Dr Hales well observes, was the immediate work of God, and concurred with the translation of Elijah to keep alive, in a degenerate, age the grand truth of a bodily resurrection, which the translation of Enoch was calculated to produce on the Antediluvian world, and which the resurrection of Christ in a glorified body fully illustrated. This great miracle, says Calmet, is a symbol and prophecy of the resurrection of Jesus Christ—there being this important difference, that Elisha raised a dead body without raising himself, while Jesus Christ not only raised himself, but gives life to all those who believe in him. "After his death," says the son of Sirach, in his eulogium on this illustrious Prophet, "his body prophesied, he did wonders in his life, and at his death his works were marvellous," Eccles. xlviii. 13.

ELISHEBAH, the name of the wife of Aaron.

ELIZABETH, or ELISABETH, the wife of Zacharias, and the mother of John the Baptist, was of the race of Aaron. She was the cousin of the blessed Virgin. An angel foretold to her husband Zacharias the birth of the Baptist, and Elisa-

beth during five months concealed her conception, but it was discovered to the Virgin Mary by a Divine announcement, as an assurance of the birth of the Messiah by herself. The Oriental Christians believe that when Herod resolved to put the infants of Bethlehem, including the son of Zacharias, to death, his mother Elisabeth carried him to a mountain to conceal him, but finding herself unable to climb up, she addressed the mountain—"Thou mountain of God, receive me and my child!" It immediately opened, received, and hid them, yet they were surrounded with light because they were guarded by an angel. Herod sent to Zacharias, demanding where his son was concealed. He refused to tell, and he was in consequence ordered to be killed in the Temple, between the altar of burnt-sacrifices and the porch.

ELNATHAN, father of the mother of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, opposed the burning of Jeremiah's prophecies by that prince. He was sent into Egypt to bring back the Prophet Urijah, Jer. xvi. 22; xxxvi. 12.

ELON, one of the Judges of Israel, who administered the government of the Hebrews ten years. He was a native of Zebulun. During his authority no war is mentioned, and nothing of importance is recorded of his administration.

ENEAS, the name of an inhabitant of the town of Lydda, who "had kept his bed eight years, and was sick of the palsy," and whom St Peter restored when he visited that town, Acts ix. 32-34.

ENOCH, the eldest son of Cain, whose name was given to the first city built in the world.

ENOCH, one of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, of the family of Seth, is described as one who "walked with God, and God took him." Nothing is known of this venerable saint beyond the fact of his translation into heaven without encountering the death of the body. St Paul in his discourse on faith introduces Enoch as the second illustrious example:—"By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and was not found, because

God had translated him; for before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God." St Jude also notices him in a very emphatic manner. After alluding to those who "have gone in the way of Cain," he tells us that Enoch, the "seventh from Adam"—thus particularised to distinguish him from Enoch the son of Cain—"prophesied of them, saying, Behold the Lord cometh, with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." From this it appears that God employed him as he did Noah, in reforming the age in which he lived, and that he inspired him to deliver the prophecy cited by St Jude.

The Orientals relate some traditions concerning Enoch, whom they call *Edris*. They allege that he received from God the gift of wisdom and knowledge in an eminent degree—that thirty volumes were sent him from heaven filled with the secrets of the most mysterious sciences—that he had a son named Sabi, whom the Sabians consider as the founder of their sect—and that his translation was the innocent cause of idolatry, for one of his friends, afflicted at his removal from earth, was instigated by the devil to form a statue of him, which so much resembled the Patriarch, that he conversed whole days with it, and paid it particular honours, which gradually degenerated into superstition. The *Book of Enoch*, specimens of which were brought into this country by Bruce from Abyssinia, and translations of parts of it published, has always been rejected by the Church. Tertullian is the only Father who speaks of it with esteem, and he alleges that it was preserved by Noah in the Ark during the Deluge.

ENOS, one of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, was the son of Seth, and died in the nine hundred and fifth year of his age.

EPAPHIRAS, a citizen of Colosse,

and coadjutor of St Paul, whom that Apostle mentions to the Colossians as "our dear fellow-servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ." It is supposed that he was bishop of Colosse. Some contend that *Epaphras* is an abbreviation of *Epaphroditus*, and that both names denote the same person.

EPAPHRODITUS, whom St Paul designates his "brother, and companion in labour, and fellow-soldier," is admitted by all ecclesiastical antiquity to have been the first bishop of Philippi. The Philippian Christians sent their contributions to relieve the wants of the Apostle by their spiritual governor, and their kindness is thus gratefully acknowledged in the Epistle addressed to them from Rome—"I have all, and abound; I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." The Greeks observe the festival of Epaphroditus on the 8th or 9th of December, and also on the 29th or 30th of March. They designate him an apostle, one of the Seventy Disciples, and bishop of Andraca or Adrias. In the Romish Calendar he is called Bishop of Terracina, and his festival is celebrated on the 22d of March.

EPENETUS, called by St Paul his "well-beloved," and the "first fruits of Achaia unto Christ," was probably a member of the family or household of Stephanas, 1 Cor. xvi. 15. The Greeks observe his festival on the 30th of July, with that of Crescens and Andronicus, and say that they all died in peace, after successfully preaching the gospel in several places. One ancient writer makes Epenetus bishop of Carthage.

ERASTUS, a preacher of the gospel sent by St Paul to Macedonia, accompanied by Timothy. He is again noticed as remaining at Corinth, of which city he was a native. In the Roman Martyrology it is said that St Paul left Erastus in Macedonia, having invested him with the apostolical functions, and that he suffered martyrdom at Philippi.

The Greeks, on the contrary, make him bishop of Paneas, near the sources of the Jordan, and allege that he died in peace, after preaching the gospel throughout the world. The Romish Calendar honours him on July 26, and the Greek on 10th November.

ESAIAS. See ISAIAH.

ESAR-HADDON, the son and successor of Sennacherib in the kingdom of Assyria, B.C. 709, or B.C. 713. He is said to have reigned thirty-five years. As Esar-haddon is only incidentally mentioned in the Scriptures, it is unnecessary to narrate all the real or alleged transactions of his reign preserved by several ancient historians. The golden age of the Assyrian Empire continued from Pul, its founder, to his time, when its boundaries extended towards the west as far as the Mediterranean. He brought the Babylonian Empire under his dominion, though he allowed it to be governed by viceroys, but his successor Sardanapalus united it with Assyria. Sargon, so called in the Prophecy of Isaiah (xxi.), who conquered Ashdod by his general, Tartan, was either Sennacherib or Esar-haddon, who, according to Jerome, had several names or appellatives.

ESAU, the ancestor of the Edomites, was the elder born brother of Jacob. He was called *Esau* at his birth from his complexion, as if more like a man than a babe, and his other name *Edom*, signifying *red*, or *red man*, had as much reference to his personal appearance as to the red pottage of which he was so fond; for we are told that when he was born he was "red, all over, like an hairy garment." Several characteristic and significant incidents, connected with the pregnancy of Rebekah, and the birth of the two brothers, are noticed by the inspired historian (Gen. xxv. 21-26).

Of the early years of Esau and of Jacob we have no information. It is simply said of them, that "the boys grew, and Esau was a cunning hunter, a man of the field, and Jacob was a plain man, dwelling in tents." They also became the respective favourites of their parents

—"Isaac loved Esau, because he did eat of his venison, but Rebekah loved Jacob." The first remarkable transaction in Esau's life, to which we are introduced, is the selling of his birthright to his brother Jacob for a mess of pottage, and, as it was attended with most important consequences in the arrangements of Divine Wisdom, it deserves a serious consideration.

It ought to be first observed, that the *birthright*, or right of primogeniture, had many privileges annexed to it. The first-born among the Hebrews was consecrated to God, had a double portion of the estate assigned to him, a dignity and authority over his brethren, the succession in the government of the family or kingdom, and, according to some authorities, the priesthood. "He had a right," says Stackhouse, "to challenge the particular blessing of his dying parent, he had the covenant which God made with Abraham—that from his loins Christ should come, consigned to him; and, what is more, these prerogatives were not confined to his person only, but descended to his latest posterity, in case they comported themselves so as to deserve them." Such were the peculiar circumstances in which Esau was placed, and such the advantages to which he was entitled, by being the elder, if it may be so expressed, of Isaac's twin sons;—in addition, he was the peculiar favourite of his father, who cherished towards him the fondest affection.

The inspired historian informs us that Jacob *sod* or *boiled* pottage. This pottage was prepared by seething lentils (*adashim*) in water, and subsequently adding a little *manteca*, or *suet*, to give them a flavour. On account of its redness it was called *edom*, and those who have tasted it describe the food as better than may be apt to be imagined. Esau, whose manners were rough and rustic, and the very reverse of Jacob, came in from the chase hungry and faint, and requested his brother to give him "that same red pottage." Jacob took advantage of his faint and craving situation,

and prescribed the conditions—"Sell me this day thy birthright." Esau, who appears to have thought himself dying, willingly agreed to the proposal. "Behold," he said, "I am at the point to die, and what profit shall this birthright do to me?" Jacob then made him swear in the most solemn manner, after which he placed before him "bread and pottage of lentils," which so revived and restored him, that after he "did eat and drink," he "rose up, and went away," probably thinking no more of the matter; and, as Moses adds, "thus Esau despised his birthright."

It is evident from the narrative that Moses does not commend Jacob for his conduct in this affair. It is doubtless true that before he was born God had designed and promised this privilege to him, but he was not entitled to seize it hastily by an irregular act of his own. He proceeded on the principle that delays were dangerous, and fearing that Esau, if he had time to consider the proposal and its consequences, would withdraw from it, he required haste both in the sale and in the oath, by which he incurred the sin of hurrying his brother into a precipitate act, which ought to have been done after very mature advice and deliberation. "In the whole affair, indeed," observes Stackhouse, "Jacob acted with a subtlety not becoming an honest man. And, in like manner, as to his interception of the blessing which his father designed for Esau, it is in vain to have recourse to *forced constructions*, or to plead the lawfulness of *mental reservations*, to excuse him in the falsehood and dissimulation of which he was certainly culpable. The best way is, upon this occasion, to lament the infirmity of human nature, which cannot always stand upright, and to admire the impartiality of the sacred writings, in which the very blemishes and transgressions of such as are designed to make the principal figure in them are not forgotten to be recorded."

This introduces us to the well known transaction considered in its proper place. Isaac, feeble, and almost blind with age,

called Esau, and said to him, "I am old, and I know not the day of my death; now therefore take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out into the field, and take (*hunt*) me some venison, such as I love, and bring it to me that I may eat, that my soul may bless thee before I die." It may seem strange that Isaac should direct Esau to procure venison by hunting, when a "kid of the goats"—a young kid still sucking its dam—would have done as well for the intended repast, as we see from the result. But, in the East, the proprietors seldom think of diminishing their flocks to supply themselves with meat unless to entertain a stranger, and they seize any game which falls in their way as eagerly as if they were not possessed of a single sheep or goat.—Other reasons might be assigned, connected with the peculiar usages of Oriental countries, especially the nomadic tribes of Arabia and Western Asia.—Esau departed to fulfil his father's commands; and Jacob, at the instigation of his mother, arrayed himself in his brother's garments, and covered his hands and his neck with the skins of young kids, to make them resemble the hairy surface of Esau's skin—a peculiarity which he inherited from his birth. In this manner he appeared before Isaac, with the "savoury meat" prepared by his mother, and deceived the venerable Patriarch by a deliberate falsehood. When he entered Isaac's tent, he approached the couch, and said, "I am Esau thy first-born; I have done according as thou badest me: arise, I pray thee, sit, and eat of my venison, that thy soul may bless me." Isaac asked him how he had found it so quickly, to which he replied, "Because the Lord thy God brought it to me." The Patriarch, who proceeded with all the caution his feeble condition permitted, said, "Come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou be my very son Esau or not." After a careful scrutiny of his person Isaac observed, "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the

hands of Esau." Still doubting, he again addressed him—"Art thou my very son Esau?" Jacob replied, "I am."—He thus repeating the falsehood, and procured the magnificent blessing, which contains a prophecy as well as a prayer—the Patriarch all the time being persuaded that he was addressing Esau.

Isaac had hardly concluded, or at least Jacob had done little more than gone out from the presence of his father, when Esau came in from hunting, and proceeded to dress the meat, which he took to Isaac, unconscious of what had occurred, saying, "Let my father arise, and eat of his son's venison, that thy soul may bless me." The aged Patriarch heard the real Esau with astonishment and doubt. "Who art thou?" he exclaimed. "I am thy son, thy first-born Esau," was the reply. Alarmed and trembling, the Patriarch could only say, "Who? where is he that hath taken venison, and brought it me, and I have eaten all before thou camest, and have blessed him, yea, and he shall be blessed?" He saw at once the deception practised upon him—he recollected his suspicions of the pretended Esau having the voice of Jacob, but he could not recall the blessing, and he probably recognised in the whole proceedings the hand of God, who often accomplishes his righteous purposes by converting human folly to the promotion of his glory. Esau immediately recognised the actor in the affair, but his grief and disappointment had not yet given place to resentment, and "he cried with a great and exceeding bitter cry, Bless me, even me also, O my father!" "Thy brother," said the afflicted Patriarch, "came with subtlety, and hath taken away thy blessing." "Is he not," replied Esau, "rightly named Jacob, for he hath supplanted me these two times? He took away my birthright, and behold now he hath taken away my blessing." Then, resuming his importunities, he addressed his father—"Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me?" Isaac again answered—"Behold I have made him thy lord, and all his

brethren have I given to him for servants; and with corn and wine have I sustained him; and what shall I do now unto thee, my son?" Still Esau urged his request, which he now felt to be peculiarly important, in the most affecting manner:—"Hast thou but one blessing, my father? Bless me, even me also, O my father." At length the Patriarch was enabled to comply in the same prophetic manner he had done when deceived by Jacob:—"Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and by the sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." Such was the favourable though limited blessing bestowed on Esau, which was wonderfully verified in succeeding times. His descendants were to live "by the sword," and the Edomites were always distinguished for their violence and martial spirit. Josephus describes them as a "turbulent and disorderly nation, always inclined to commotions, and rejoicing in changes; at the least adulation of those who beseech them beginning war, and hastening to battles as it were to a feast."

Esau cherished the most deadly hatred towards Jacob for his conduct in this transaction, and vowed to revenge the injury he had received. He said in his heart, "The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob"—a finely-expressed Oriental adage, in which the anticipated death of a parent is indicated by the sorrow and mourning it would occasion. But Esau had made no secret of his intention. His words were repeated to Rebekah his mother, and, alarmed for the safety of her favourite son, she informed him of his brother's resolution, and advised him to betake himself to a place of security, where he would be safe from Esau's resentment. Jacob was accordingly sent to his uncle Laban in Haran, the brother of his mother, and here he experienced some of those trials to which

his duplicity and falsehood in the matters of the birthright and the blessing rendered him liable. He was in a manner banished from his father's house—his uncle dealt deceitfully with him, as he had done with his father, and treated him with rigour; and his mother, who had suggested the fraud to him, never saw him again.

When Esau was forty years of age—apparently some time before the transaction already noticed, he married two wives—Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath, the daughter of Elon the Hittite, "which caused a grief of mind to Isaac and to Rebekah." And here it may be observed, that if Rebekah had reminded Isaac of what had been divinely communicated to her before the birth of the twins—that the "elder shall serve the younger," and had shown that Esau had forfeited the blessing peculiar to the first-born by voluntarily selling his birthright, and by marrying strange wives, her conduct would have been justly considered honourable and upright. If, moreover, this blessing was, as some suppose, an appendage to the birthright, Jacob, when he purchased the one, whatever might have been the conditions, was entitled to the other. There is a strong intimation in the text that Esau had displeased his parents by his marriages, but it is certain that he had received his father's favour before he was supplanted in the blessing by Jacob. After the departure of the latter to his uncle Laban, Esau, who saw that his former connections had caused great distress to his parents, married Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar.

Nothing is known of Esau during the long residence of Jacob with Laban except that he had conquered the Land of Seir, the territory of his descendants the Edomites in Arabia Petraea, the capital of which was the celebrated excavated city of Petra, and the extraordinary remains of which have been recently described by several enterprising travellers. When Jacob took his final leave of and departure from Laban, with his wives, his children,

his servants, and his numerous flocks, and set out on his return to Canaan, he sent messengers to his brother Esau in the most friendly manner to propose a meeting—an act which was cordially acknowledged by the latter, who prepared to meet him attended by four hundred men. This latter announcement was heard by Jacob with considerable dread, fearing that his brother's resentment would be revived against him, and that he would make a hostile attack on his pastoral family. He arranged his retinue in such a manner that if one division fell, the other could effect an escape, while he prudently conveyed his wives and family to the other side of the Jabbok. The meeting, however, was different from what Jacob had even allowed himself to anticipate, and he regarded Esau's kind reception of him as a token of the Divine favour. Jacob "passed over [the Jabbok] before them" [his wives and children], when Esau approached, and he "bowed himself to the ground seven times until he came near to his brother." This intimates that Jacob, on approaching his brother, stopped at intervals and bowed, and then advanced and bowed again, until the seventh bow brought him near to Esau—a mark of profound respect, which is still observed by younger towards elder brothers in the East. We are told that Esau "ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck, and kissed him, and they wept." On this occasion the ancestor of the Edomites appears in a very favourable manner. His generous and open temper is apparent in his affectionate deportment towards his brother, and his utter oblivion of the treatment he had received from him. Esau made inquiries after Jacob's family, and the scene which followed is admirably descriptive of an Oriental introduction in the pastoral districts. Esau appeared as a distinguished and powerful chief, at the head of four hundred hardy followers, whereas the company of Jacob had no military aspect, and consisted indiscriminately of men, women, and children. When Esau asked, in reference to

the latter, "Who are those with thee?"—he was answered by his brother—"The children whom God hath graciously given thy servant." Then we have the scene—"The handmaidens came near, they and their children, and they bowed themselves. And Leah also with her children came near, and bowed themselves, and after came Joseph near and Rachel, and they bowed themselves." Jacob had previously set aside a present for his brother, which gives us a tolerable estimate of the immense pastoral wealth he had acquired—"two hundred she-goats, and twenty he-goats, two hundred ewes, and twenty rams; thirty milch camels with their colts, forty kine, and ten bulls, twenty she-asses, and ten foals." This present Esau at first refused, declaring, "I have enough, my brother, keep that thou hast unto thyself." At length he accepted it, and invited Jacob to Seir, offering to accompany him thither, but the latter declared, in language which shows that while he had no intention to accept it, he was also afraid directly to refuse; and Esau returned to Seir, while Jacob continued his journey to the place afterwards called Succoth, not far from the Jordan and east of that river, afterwards included in the territory of the tribe of Gad.

The only other notice of Esau is his assisting with Jacob to bury their father Isaac, B. C. 1729. The time of his own death is not recorded. The inspired historian gives us an account of his removal to Mount Seir, and a list of his sons and descendants (Gen. xxxvi. 1-19), the chiefs of whom were called *Dukes*. The Edomites latterly comprehended two fraternal nations—those descended from Esau who remained in Mount Seir, and who joined themselves to the descendants of that Nabajoth whose full sister, the daughter of Ishmael, Esau had married—and that colony who occupied the south of Judea during the captivity of the Jews. As it respects Esau himself, his character is not made the subject of any particular comment by any of the subsequent inspired writers, and Moses notices him

without any direct censure. St Paul calls him a *profane person*, and says that he was *hated by God*, but these expressions are not to be understood in a literal sense. The Apostle designates him *profane*, not because he was peculiarly wicked, but because he was evidently not so anxious about the spiritual promises made to his family as was Jacob, and consequently not so fit to be the heir of the mercies resulting from those promises; and all that is meant by the expression *hated by God* is simply that God did not honour him with the same marks of distinction as he did to Jacob. It is the design of the Apostle to show that God had bestowed the favours which the promise of the Messiah implied on whom he pleased—on Abraham, not on Lot—on Jacob, not on Esau—and, by extending his reasoning, on the Gentiles, who were made the people of God at the time he wrote, and not on the Jews. “It appears,” says Bishop Newton, “that Jacob was a man of more religion, and believed the Divine promises more than Esau. The posterity of Jacob likewise preserved the true religion and the worship of one God, while the Edomites were sunk in idolatry; and of the seed of Jacob was born at last the Saviour of the world. This was the peculiar privilege and advantage of Jacob, to be the happy instrument of conveying these spiritual blessings to all nations. This was his greatest superiority over Esau, and in this sense St Paul applies the prophecy, *The elder shall serve the younger*. The Christ, the Saviour of the world, was to be born of some one family, and Jacob’s was preferred to Esau’s out of the good pleasure of Almighty God, who is certainly the best judge of fitness and expedience, and hath an undoubted right to dispense his favours as he shall see proper.”

It appears that the Edomites, or descendants of Esau, were at first governed patriarchally by emirs or chiefs, and they afterwards established a monarchy so early as to have eight kings before there was any king in Israel. Their empire at the time of Moses was in a very flourish-

ing condition. Eight considerable cities are mentioned, and also fields, vineyards, and highways, in their country. They refused to listen to the repeated request of the Hebrews for a peaceable passage through their territories, and even intercepted them in their march by a numerous army; but they allowed them to pass undisturbed along their frontiers, and sold them provisions. On this account war was prohibited against the Edomites, and it was enacted that in the tenth generation they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship. They conducted themselves peaceably towards the Hebrews till the time of David, when their aggressions caused a war in which they were conquered. Their subsequent history is often noticed by the sacred historians. After the destruction of Jerusalem we hear nothing farther of the Idumeans, as the Edomites were then called, and in the third century they had ceased to be a distinct people, having amalgamated themselves with the Arab tribes.

The Rabbins designate Rome the *cruel empire of Edom*, and allege that the Romans were descendants of Esau, or Edomites. The Mahometans consider both the Greeks and Romans to be descended from *Roum*, the son of Esau, though it does not appear that Esau had a son so called. It is observed by Abravanel, a Jewish writer, on this curious traditional theory, that we may call the subjects of the Roman Empire, and Christians in general, *Edomites*, with the same propriety as Isaiah addresses the sinners of his time as the *rulers of Sodom and the people of Gomorrah*. The following is his very charitable and extraordinary parallel between the Romans and Idumeans, which is a fair specimen of the reveries of the Rabbins in former times:—“The Romans had, like Esau and Jacob, a common father, even God. Esau by his marriage allied the family of the Patriarchs to strangers, and the Roman Empire and the (Roman) Catholic Church are composed of various nations who are all equally offensive to God. Esau hated Jacob, and wished to take from him his

birthright, his property, and his life, and the Christians treat the Israelites in the same manner. Esau was born under the planet Mars, and was therefore a blood-thirsty man and a hunter; and the Idumean heroes, his descendants, who ruled over Italy, were cannibals, who devoured the bodies of their enemies whom they had slain. Farther, the Roman Emperors were dressed in scarlet, because Esau was of a red colour; the cardinals also wear a red dress for the same reason."—These opinions are unquestionably too absurd to require refutation.

"Josephus Gorionides," says Professor Jahn, "produces the following reason why the Roman Empire was called Edom. Zepho, the grandson of Esau [the son of Eliphaz, the son of Esau by Adah, the daughter of Elon the Hittite, Gen. xxxvi. 2, 15], was detained as a prisoner in Egypt by Joseph. He escaped to Carthage, and was made commander-in-chief of the army of Æneas, king of that city. Æneas invaded Italy from Africa, twice defeated Turnus, the king of Beneventum, and carried away his betrothed wife Jania, or Lavinia. Pablus, the nephew of Æneas, and Turnus were killed in battle, and two towers or mausoleums were erected to their memory, which were still to be seen in the time of Gorionides between Alba and Rome. The Africans frequently invaded Italy under the command of Zepho. In one of these expeditions Zepho lost a calf, which was found in the possession of a monster, half goat and half man, who lived in a cavern concealed by woods. Zepho killed him, and rescued his calf. The inhabitants, being delivered from the monster who had destroyed their flocks, regarded Zepho as a demi-god, to whom sacrifices were to be offered. They called him Janus from the monster which he killed, and also Saturn from a star which was worshipped at the time. Thus, then, Janus and Saturn were the same individual, and the grandson of Esau, who ruled over a part of Italy during his life, and was worshipped as a god after his death. Romulus, the founder of Rome,

appeared long after Æneas, and reigned thirty-eight years. David, during his reign, made war with the Idumeans, and was deserted by Adareser and Zir, who took refuge in Italy. There they built Alba, where according to Josephus their posterity still lived in his time. Romulus feared that David would claim the fugitives as his subjects, and that the protection he had granted them would occasion a war; and therefore he inclosed the temples of his gods and the palaces of his predecessors with a wall forty-five miles in circumference. Thus, then, according to Gorionides, the Jews of Italy are the descendants of Esau, the grandson of Esau, and of two officers of the palace of David, who took refuge in Alba and Purenhim. From this extract the reader can judge of the character of Gorionides as a writer, and of the good taste of the nation who preferred such an historian to the genuine Josephus. Abravanel, who has cited this passage to prove that Zepho emigrated to Italy, departs from the original, and supposes that Zepho built Palermo, and settled in Sicily as well as in Italy. He is followed by Fazellus, who in his History of Sicily produces in support of his opinion two inscriptions, which were dug up in the city of Palermo in such ancient characters that neither the Greeks, Arabians, nor Chaldeans, were able to decipher them. One of these inscriptions informs us that Isaac, the son of Abraham, being king of Idumea, and Esau his son being king of the Valley of Damas, a body of Jews, accompanied by a great body of Syrians and Phenicians, landed in Sicily, and established themselves on that beautiful spot called Palermo. The other inscription was as follows:—*There is but one God. He alone is Almighty. He whom we adore is the only God who giveth victory. The governor of this tower is Saphas, the son of Eliphaz, the son of Esau, the brother of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham.* If we may believe the Jews, their nation have inhabited both Sicily and Italy from the time of Esau; and they support their assertions

by the above and other inscriptions.— These possess doubtless some claims to antiquity, but they are not on that account the more worthy of credit, for we are satisfied that Italy was peopled from Greece." This learned writer then gives "the true origin of the Romans, to show that they descended from the Greeks, and not from Esau or Jacob." The inscription which he quotes was found and explained in 1740; the other, the substance of which he gives, was discovered in the reign of William II., surnamed the Good, towards the close of the twelfth century.

ESTHER, formerly called HADASSAH, queen of Artaxerxes Longimanus, king of Persia (see AHASUERUS), was a beautiful Jewish captive, the cousin of Mordecai, also a Jewish captive, of the tribe of Benjamin. We are told in the Book which bears her name, that Mordecai "brought up Hadassah, that is, Esther, his uncle's daughter, for she had neither father nor mother, and the maid was fair and beautiful; whom Mordecai, when his father and mother were dead, took for his own daughter." Her father's name was Abihail, but that of her mother is not mentioned, and as it respects the lineage of Mordecai it is simply stated that he was "the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjamite," and it is evident that he held some official appointment at the palace. The virtuous refusal of Vashti, the queen of Ahasuerus, to appear unveiled in a drunken revelry at the king's command, was the cause of her forfeiture of the royal favour; and the absurd law of the Medes and Persians that the king's decree was irrevocable, and could not be altered under any circumstances, rendered her restoration to the favour of the now relenting monarch illegal. His counsellors, seven in number, when they perceived him "remembering Vashti," namely, his former affection for her reviving, sought to divert his mind by a new object, and at their suggestion officers were appointed throughout the empire "to gather together all the fair young

virgins unto Shushan the palace, to the house of the women, unto the custody of Hege [or Hegai] the king's chamberlain," and the "maiden which pleased the king was to be queen instead of Vashti." Mordecai sent his beautiful and orphaned relative among the rest, and Divine Providence determined the choice of the luxurious Persian despot in favour of one who was to be the means of preserving the Jewish people in a time of imminent danger. During the preparation to introduce Esther to the king, she fortunately secured the favour of Hegai, the "keeper of the women," and "he preferred her and her maids unto the best place of the house of the women." This "keeper of the women" was probably an officer answering to the *daroga*, or chief eunuch of the modern Persian harem, who is generally an aged and disagreeable person, but whose office is one of high trust and responsibility, with commensurate authority over the women. He is to them, next to the king, the most important person in the world, their comfort depending solely on his favour, and to obtain it is a high object of ambition and rivalry among them. During this probation course of "purification," as it is called, to which Esther, in common with the other candidates for the royal favour, was obliged to submit, she carefully concealed the fact that she was a Jewess, in obedience to the cautious injunctions of Mordecai, who wisely judged that it would prejudice the Persian monarch against her; but he evinced his intense anxiety as to the result by walking "every day before the court of the women's house, to know how Esther did, and what should become of her." This anxiety on the part of Mordecai will appear the more ardent when we recollect the vigilance with which the harems of the East are guarded, and that he was probably a full year walking day after day endeavouring to obtain intelligence of or from his interesting relative. Sir John Chardin informs us, and the fact he mentions is corroborated by all travellers, that "the place where the women are shut up is

sacred, especially among persons of condition, and it is a crime for any one whatever to be inquiring what passes within those walls.—A man may walk a hundred days one after another by the house where the women are, and yet know no more of what is done therein than at the farther end of Tartary.”

The author of the Book of Esther gives us an account of the procedure within the harem of Ahasuerus on this occasion of selecting a queen. It appears that it required twelve months to accomplish the *purification* of each candidate for the royal favour—“six months with oil of myrrh, and six months with sweet odours, and with other things.” After this process the female was conducted to those apartments, called the *king's house*, which are in the harem or innermost building of the palace, and form his own proper residence. It farther appears to have been the arrangement that the female so purified, whose turn it was to be presented to the luxurious Persian, was introduced to him in the evening, and on the morning she was sent to the “second house of the women,” and committed to the custody of a eunuch, called the “king's chamberlain;” but “she came into the king no more except the king delighted in her, and that she were called by name.” It is not to be supposed, however, that these females were returned to their friends after the queen had been chosen. On the contrary, they were immured in the harem, and formed the royal establishment of women. They became *secondary wives* (the queen being the first or chief), rendered *concubines* in our version; and as they had already engaged the notice of the king, they occupied a part of the harem different from that in which they had previously lived, but equally distinct from the women not thus distinguished, and therefore for the time of an inferior class.

It is evident that details such as these, which are of a peculiar description, must be treated with great delicacy, and in a manner suitable to the design of the present work, which is to illustrate Scripture

history. But the only proper way of doing so is by references to existing usages in Oriental countries, and especially in Persia, where the female establishments of the kings, like many of the customs and habits of the people, appear to have undergone little change from the most ancient times. It is the same now in the selection of the women for the harem from the various provinces, and their treatment under the control of the *daroga*, or chief eunuch, as it was in the days of Ahasuerus. We must not therefore judge of the peculiar manners and customs of the Orientals by any reference to our own, and we must in the first instance take them as we find them—not as we wish them to be, and as doubtless they would be, were they guided by the same principles of religion and civilization which prevail in Christian countries. When it was Esther's turn to be introduced to Ahasuerus, she was taken into the royal apartments of the harem in the seventh year of his reign, and her surpassing loveliness at once captivated the monarch. He found her superior in every respect to all the other females who had been presented to him, beautiful though they were, and excelling even Vashti, whom he had “remembered” with fond affection and perplexity. Esther was immediately promoted by the royal favour to be queen, and the “royal crown was set upon her head.” Josephus informs us that when she was brought before the king he was exceedingly delighted with her, and made her his lawful wife, and when she came into the palace he put a crown upon her head. The royal nuptials were celebrated with magnificent entertainments, all the provinces were released from a certain portion of their taxes in honour of the new queen, and splendid presents were made to her and to the favourites of the court. We are told that “the virgins were gathered together the second time,” namely, at the time of this marriage of Ahasuerus with Esther, to whom the latter, as we find in the case of Vashti, gave a feast—this being in strict accordance with

existing Oriental usages, which oblige women to feast separately from the men even on the same occasions of rejoicing.

But who was Esther—of what lineage was she, who thus had been elevated to share the throne of the proud ruler over “an hundred and twenty-seven provinces”—who reigned “from India even to Ethiopia?” No one seemed to know, and, what is more, Ahasuerus himself was ignorant, nor did he or his courtiers apparently make any inquiries. In Europe the family and descent of the princess who marries the poorest potentate is carefully examined, and such alliances are for the most part formed from ambitious motives, or from political considerations. Such an elevation as that of Esther—the daughter of Jewish captives, and a poor orphan, who had been protected by the kindness of a relative who, himself a Jew, had neither influence nor wealth—would astonish all Europe, and especially the subjects of the sovereign who ventured to form such a connection. Some would think him insane, others would ridicule his folly, and others, again, would treat it as a disgrace to their country, its dignity and splendour, and degrading to the crown. It was different, however, as it still is, with the Oriental princes, whose pride of genealogy was all on one side, and who, from the peculiar position in which women are situated in those countries, care little for female descent, and often form such connections and marriages as suit their own pleasure and inclinations. Youth and beauty were the chief if not the essential recommendations, and it mattered little whether the possessor of these qualities was the daughter of a prince or a captive. The Oriental despots were too much influenced by caprice, or too much impressed with a consciousness of their own superiority, to be guided at all times by political considerations, or to confine their alliances to women of royal or noble descent. Such a feeling will always exist in luxurious and half-civilized countries, where females are absurdly held as inferior to men, and

are deprived of that equality and respect which they are entitled to command and to receive. The harem was thus peopled from the different provinces of the empire, and the surveillance of the whole given to eunuchs, who classified the women according to their age, their beauty, and the favour in which they were held by the sovereign. It is indeed said by Herodotus that the queen-consort was chosen from the family of Cyrus, or from that of the Achæmenidæ, but Vashti was evidently not of either of those illustrious lines, and the case of Esther completely proves that concubines were often elevated to that rank, and invested with the insignia of royalty. It appears that Persian etiquette simply demanded that a whole year should be spent in purification by means of aromatics and costly perfumes, before the novice beauty was thought worthy of approaching the presence of the despot. So little was known of Esther that even her religion was not suspected, and no one seemed to make any inquiries respecting her. We are told that even after her marriage she “had not yet showed her kindred nor her people, as Mordecai had charged her; for Esther did the commandment of Mordecai, like as when she was brought up with him.”

Shortly after Esther's elevation it happened that Bigthana and Teresh, two of the king's officers, entered into a conspiracy to murder Ahasuerus. Mordecai, who “sat in the king's gate,” obtained information of their design, and communicated it to Esther, who carefully intimated it to the king, mentioning Mordecai as the person who had given her the important information. From the frequent mention of Mordecai as sitting at the royal gate, it is evident that he held some office at the court. It was, and still is, the custom in the East for officers of the state to wait about the gates and the outer courts of the palace, until their attendance was required by their prince. Xenophon mentions the custom as prevalent in Persia in his time, and ascribes the origin of it to a resolution

passed in an assembly of Persians and others, that men of rank and consideration should always attend at the gates of Cyrus, and be ready to serve him at all times, until he dismissed them. It is not mentioned in what way Mordecai became acquainted with the conspiracy, but his timely notice of it saved the king's life. The whole affair was investigated, the persons implicated were put to death, and the atrocious design, as well as the good service rendered by Mordecai, was registered in the "book of the chronicles," in the presence of the king.

In the Book of Esther, and in those of Ezra and Nehemiah, there are repeated allusions to this record called *the book of the chronicles*, which intimate the care taken by the ancient Persian government to register every occurrence. A similar practice prevailed in the court of the Hebrew kings, and it was followed in other Oriental nations. These documents are all lost, and only a few extracts are preserved by the inspired historians and the older Greek writers. But the united testimony of the sacred and profane historians affords us ample information respecting the whole system, and no nation of antiquity seems to have been so careful as the Persians to preserve the memory of its exploits by written documents. Herodotus, in his description of the review made by Xerxes of his vast army, tells us that, "mounted on his car, he examined each nation in their turn. To all of them he proposed certain questions, the replies to which were noted down by his secretaries." Again, the same Persian monarch, "placed on mount Ægaleos, which is opposite to Salamis, was particularly attentive to the battle, and when he saw any person eminently distinguish himself, he was minute in his inquiries concerning his family and city, all which, at his direction, his scribes recorded."—"The Persians," says Heeren, "had not, as far as we know, any historical poet, far less any historian, properly so called—a want common to all the East. The sort of history they did possess was closely connected with their polity, and

was a part of their despotic government, and of the almost idolatrous respect in which the kings were held. Whatever their monarchs said or did was of course worthy of being recorded, and to this intent his person was usually surrounded by scribes or secretaries, whose office it was to register all his words and actions. They were in almost constant attendance on the sovereign, and especially when he appeared in public. They are repeatedly mentioned, on very dissimilar occasions, by Jewish as well as Grecian writers. They attended the monarch at the celebration of festivals, at public reviews, and even in the midst of the tumult of battle, and noted down the words which fell from him at such seasons. To them also was committed the task of reducing to writing the commands and ordinances of the king, which, according to the custom of the East, were recorded from the mouth of the monarch, and being sealed with his signet, were immediately dispatched according to their destination. This institution was not peculiar to the Persians, but prevailed among all the principal nations of Asia. The king's scribes are mentioned in the earliest records of the Mongol conquerors, and it is well known that Hyder Ali usually appeared in public surrounded by forty such secretaries. Such was the origin of the chronicles or diaries of the Persians, which, being deposited in the principal cities of the empire—Susa, Babylon, and Ecbatana, formed what were called the archives of the kingdom. A history compiled from such materials would necessarily be a history of the court rather than of the empire."

The providential elevation of Esther to be the consort of Ahasuerus begins now to be developed in a very remarkable manner. Haman, an Amalekite or Agagite by birth or nation, and supposed by Josephus to have been a descendant of the kings of those ancient enemies of the Jews, was by the peculiar favour of Ahasuerus advanced to the highest station in the empire, and his "seat was set above all the princes." The extraordi-

nary influence which this haughty upstart exercised at the court procured for him servile flatteries and homage of all connected with the royal household—"all the king's servants that were in the king's gate bowed and revered Haman, for the king had so commanded concerning him." To the astonishment and mortification of Haman, however, Mordecai studiously declined to follow the general example, and neither "bowed nor did him reverence." This conduct soon became the subject of conversation, and Mordecai was asked why he ventured to "transgress the king's commandment?" They expostulated and reasoned with him daily on the danger he incurred, while some of them had already directed the attention of Haman to this obvious insult, which in an Oriental country is of the most irritating description, when we consider the particular attention paid to external forms and etiquette. To us it may appear trifling, and not a little unreasonable, for Haman to be thus exasperated at Mordecai's conduct, but in the East the act of bowing is different from what it is amongst us, and it was a common mark of respect to all great persons. In the case before us a particular command was not necessary, nor would Mordecai have refused it at the peril of his countrymen as well as of himself, but it is evident that something approximating to external adoration was intended, such as was addressed to the Persian monarchs themselves, and this being a species of idolatry, the upright Jew refused to pay it on conscientious principles. The author of the Apocryphal additions to the Book of Esther thus interprets the conduct of Mordecai, and represents him as praying in these words:—"Thou knowest all things, and thou knowest, Lord, that it was neither in contempt nor pride, nor for any desire of glory, that I did not bow down to proud Haman; for I could have been content to kiss the soles of his feet. But I did this that I might not prefer the glory of man above the glory of God, neither will I worship any but thee, O God."

Being probably urged to give a reason for his extraordinary conduct towards a man of such power as Haman, Mordecai candidly confessed that he was a Jew, and that such homage was contrary to the religious principles of his nation, thereby wishing to show that it was neither pride nor obstinacy which made him unwilling to comply with the king's order. Haman was carefully informed that Mordecai was a Jew, and although he was exasperated against him, "he thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone; for they had showed him the people of Mordecai; wherefore Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus." From this express statement that the proud Amalekite—one of a nation long doomed to destruction by Divine command—intended to involve all the Jews in a general massacre, it is probable that Mordecai's refusal to do him homage was imitated by all the Jews, otherwise we cannot discover even in the most malicious mind any ground for the design of destroying the whole people. In the prosecution of this diabolical conspiracy we are told that "in the first month, that is, the month Nisan, in the twelfth year of king Ahasuerus, they cast Pur, that is, the lot, before Haman from day to day, and from month to month, to the twelfth month, that is, the month Adar." The Septuagint preserves a clause in this verse which more forcibly explains its meaning:—"They cast Pur, that is, the lot, before Haman, from day to day, and from month to month, that he might destroy in one day the race of Mordecai, and the lot fell for the fourteenth of the twelfth month, that is, the month Adar." It was the custom of the Orientals to inquire, by casting lots, what time would be fortunate or unfortunate for the execution of any considerable design—a practice still in full vigour in the East, and particularly among the Persians. The lucky day or hour is sought on all occasions by all classes of persons, and no one undertakes a journey or transacts any business without consulting an astro

loger, or, in his absence, a peculiarly constructed almanac, which points out the lucky and unlucky days. By their rules of divination the Persian astrologers on this occasion supposed that the last month, called Adar, in the year would be propitious, and afterwards the thirteenth day of that month was chosen for Haman's purpose. Here it will be observed that, as the day was full eleven months after the time that the lots were cast, the providence of God is particularly apparent in arranging so long an interval, that there might be sufficient time to adopt the requisite measures for preventing the intended calamity.

At this time the Jews were very numerous in Persia. Multitudes of them remained in the countries whither they had been carried captive, not accepting the permission to return granted them by Cyrus. In the midst of the Persian idolatry they preserved their religion, and transmitted it to their posterity. It therefore required considerable time to mature all the plans for the general massacre, and to allow the messengers dispatched with the royal edict for that purpose to reach the remote provinces of the empire. Haman procured the royal decree against them in the most artful manner. He represented to the king that a "certain people were scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of his kingdom, and their laws were diverse from all people, neither kept they the king's laws: and it was not for the king's profit to suffer them." He continued—"If it please the king, let it be written that they may be destroyed, and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver to the hands of those that have the charge of the business, to bring it into the king's treasures." This sum, which Haman offered to the king as an indemnity for the loss of the tribute paid by the Jews into the royal treasury, amounted to upwards of two millions of our money. It is remarkable that Haman, who was a foreigner and probably a captive, could have amassed such wealth at the court of Persia as the

offer implies, yet we are to recollect that he was the chief minister of the king, and placed in a situation in which he had peculiar facilities for acquiring enormous riches. We also find Nehemiah in a condition to sustain the charges of his government from his own resources, although he was a captive, and in a much inferior situation to Haman. At present, on the first day of the year in Persia, the king receives the offerings of his princes and nobles; and Mr Morier, who was present on one occasion, informs us that the gift of the individual who held the situation of Haman surpassed every other in value, and amounted to about L.30,000 sterling in gold coin. Herodotus and others mention instances of the extraordinary wealth possessed by some of the subjects of the ancient Persian Empire.

Ahasuerus refused the tempting offer, but willingly acceded to the request of his minister. He took the ring from his hand and gave it to Haman, that he might seal the royal edict; the king's secretaries were summoned, and intimations were sent to all the governors of the provinces, in the several languages of the people. "in the name of king Ahasuerus, and sealed with the king's ring, to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish, all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, in one day, even upon the thirteenth day of the twelfth month, which is the month Adar, and to take the spoil of them for a prey. The copy of the writing for a commandment to be given in every province was published unto all people, that they should be ready against that day," after which the king and Haman "sat down to drink."

In this procedure we have a remarkable instance of cunning on the part of Haman, and of Oriental despotism and tyranny on the part of Ahasuerus. The former made no allusion to Mordecai individually, as that would have defeated his object, but he is included among all the Jews, and his destruction was certain. The Persian decree could not be recalled, and Haman on the day of the

massacre would take especial care that Mordecai should not escape. In his address to the king he dwells chiefly on the peculiarities of the Jewish customs, which frequently caused the reproaches of the heathens against them. A few centuries after this Tacitus represented the Jews as a people whose religious rites were contrary to all the world, and Cicero asserted that the Jewish religion was wholly inconsistent with the splendour and ancient institutions of the Roman Empire, and with the dignity of the Roman name. But the conduct of Ahasuerus is the more odious, in quietly acquiescing in the massacre of so many of his subjects, who were living peaceably throughout his provinces, to gratify the wishes of an unprincipled minister. We have here an instance of the monstrous corruption of the court, and the gratification of the passions—the thirst for vengeance, and the impulse of hatred on the part of Haman, being no less conspicuous than the idle voluptuousness and despotic pride of the head of this polluted circle. He seems to have known little of the existence of the Jews throughout his dominions, and he coolly sanctions the exterminating massacre without inquiring what they had done to merit such deadly punishment. Oriental despotism perhaps precluded this knowledge, and Oriental indolence would not make any examination. Agreeably to the custom of the Eastern monarchs, the kings of Persia resided in the interior of their palaces, seldom appearing in public, and guarding all means of access to their persons. “The crowd of ministers and courtiers,” says Heeren, “were consequently obliged to take their stations, according to their degrees of rank, in the court without, or before the gate or porte of the palace: and respect for the monarch prescribed, especially in his actual presence, a rigid system of etiquette, the discipline of which commenced with the early youth of those who were compelled to observe it. The number of courtiers, masters of ceremonies, guards, and others, was endless. It was through

them alone that access could be gained to the monarch, and they were consequently invested with titles which betokened their relation to him, being styled the king’s eyes, the king’s ears, &c. because no one without permission, or without their intervention, could approach his presence.”

The edict for the massacre of the Jews was “sent by posts into all the king’s provinces.” Herodotus and Xenophon give us explanations of this allusion to the arrangements of the Persians in their internal communications with the provinces. “There is no method of conveyance,” says the former, “more expeditious than these messengers. They are ordered in the following way: Men with horses are kept in readiness at stations distant one day’s journey from each other. Intelligence is forwarded by the first of these messengers to the second, and by him to the third, and so on to the last. Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor darkness, prevents them from performing their course with the greatest speed.”—“I find,” says Xenophon, “that Cyrus set on foot another contrivance beneficial to his vast empire, by means of which he gained early information of what was doing in remote parts of his dominions. He formed establishments of stables, horses, and attendants, as far distant from each other as a horse could travel with ease in one day, and at each of these stations he appointed a person to receive and transmit the letters brought by the messengers, and to see that the men and horses were taken care of after their journey, and that fresh ones were sent forward. Sometimes these journeys were not intermitted during the night, the messenger to whose turn it fell to travel at night proceeding as he who had travelled during the day.”

When the decree for the massacre of the Jews was promulgated, and rendered irrevocable according to the established law of the Medes and Persians, the “city Shushan was perplexed.” This probably refers to the consternation and alarm of the Jews in that city, which would be

shared by the captives of other nations, whose fears would induce them to expect the same barbarous treatment either on that or on some future occasion. None more distinguished himself in demonstrations of grief at this great threatened calamity than Mordecai. He "rent his clothes, and put on sackcloth with ashes, and went out into the midst of the city, and cried with a loud and bitter cry, and came even before the king's gate, for none might enter into the king's gate clothed with sackcloth." In every province the Jews exhibited the same terror and distress, and there seemed no chance of escape from the impending destruction. To petition the despot was unnecessary—no power could recall the edict, and if such had been possible, the application must have been transmitted to Haman, the instigator of the whole. The devoted Jews could only "fast, and weep, and wail," while many of them lay in sackcloth and ashes. In the Targum it is stated that when Mordecai had cried aloud in the midst of the city the Jews gathered round him, and that he caused the book of the Law to be brought to the gate of Shushan, and read therein the words of Moses (Deut. iv. 30, 31)—"When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God and shalt be obedient to his voice (for the Lord thy God, is a merciful God), he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he sware unto them." After this he exhorted them to fasting, humiliation, and repentance, according to the example of the Ninevites.

It is to be observed, that the threatened massacre of the Jews and all the proceedings of Haman were unknown in the secluded apartments of the harem. In Persia the mode of life of the queen-consort was no less rigidly prescribed and limited than that of the secondary class of women called the concubines. At various periods of the Persian history, we find a different procedure, and the passions of hatred and jealousy, which

are apt to become intense in proportion as their sphere is limited, attained repeatedly in the harem of Persia a degree of rancour which imagination can hardly picture. But Esther, although we subsequently find her acting a bold, vigorous, and energetic part, conformed to the rigid etiquette of the court, and remained in seclusion with her attendants in the harem, having no knowledge of external affairs, and no communication with any except the king and the eunuchs of the palace. It was indeed almost impossible that the queen could obtain any direct knowledge of public affairs, for in ancient as well as in modern Persia there was scarcely any thing which could be called a council of state. Some matters of importance were occasionally, it may be often, discussed during various reigns in the interior of the seraglio, under the influence of the queen-mother, the favourite wife, and the eunuchs, but it was only on occasions of some great expeditions being meditated that councils were held for any length of time, to which the satraps, the tributary princes, and the commanders of the forces, were invited. The principal question even then was for the most part already settled, and the deliberation simply respected the means of carrying it into execution. In the present case the massacre of the Jews was settled solely by the king and Haman, the former probably thinking the extermination of a set of captives, of whom he had heard such unfavourable reports, too trivial to require any farther discussion. Yet even in such points as this the despotic character of the government manifested itself, for he who gave any advice was obliged to answer for its issue, and in case of ill success, or any other impediment, the penalty fell on his own head. Haman bitterly experienced the effect of this, and by a righteous retribution became the victim of the harem—of the reigning queen, who had secured the influence of the eunuchs.

When Esther was informed by her *chamberlains*, or eunuchs, of Mordecai's distress, which they did without being

aware that she was in any way related to him, she sent a change of clothes to induce him to lay aside his sack-cloth, but he would not accept the gift. She then requested to see one of the king's eunuchs, named Hatach, who had been appointed to attend her, and entrusted him with a message to Mordecai, to "know what it was, and why it was." The faithful eunuch found the distressed Jew at his usual position in the street, before the royal gate, and was informed of all the circumstances, and "of the sum of the money that Haman had promised to pay to the king's treasures for the Jews to destroy them." He also gave the eunuch a copy of the decree issued against the Jews, which he requested him to present to Esther, and to "charge her that she should go in unto the king, to make supplication unto him, and to make request before him for her people."

The eunuch, who heard these affecting details for the first time, being previously as ignorant of them as the queen, informed Esther of all that had passed between him and Mordecai. She was struck with horror at the fate which awaited her nation, and was seemingly at a loss how to avert it. Hatach was ordered to return to Mordecai, and to intimate to him a singular law which then prevailed at the Persian court. "All the king's servants," she said, "and the people of the king's provinces do know, that whosoever, whether man or woman, shall come unto the king, into the inner court, who is not called, there is one law of his to put them to death, except such to whom the king shall hold out the golden sceptre, that he may live; but I have not been called to come in unto the king these thirty days." In the latter part of this intimation Esther evidently supposes that the king's favour towards her was probably diminished, as she had had no communication or interview with him during that time, and that she was afraid any petition she might present would not be favourably received. The law to which she alludes, excluding all from the

king's presence unless they were summoned thereto, is supposed by some to have been procured by Haman, but it is mentioned by Herodotus, and must therefore have been an ancient law of the country. The Greek historians often notice the difficulty of access to the Persian monarchs, and relate that the freedom of ingress to the sovereign's presence was first checked by Dejoces, who directed that no one, whatever might be his rank, his nearest attendants excepted, should appear before him unless specially called, and that all business was to be transacted through messengers and ministers. The law mentioned by Esther appears to have been general, although originally the queen was probably not intended to be included, but the fair Jewess considered herself not exempted from its application. The rule, as observed in Esther's time, was, that even when the king was in his outer apartments no one was to appear before him uncalled, but when in his interior residence the most dignified inmates of the palace could not approach him unbidden. It is by explanations of these old laws that we can understand the intense veneration with which the royal person has always been regarded in Persia and other Oriental countries. Those kings have always made it a matter of policy to be of difficult approach, and to be rarely seen by their subjects—to preclude any attempt at assassination, and to foster the general feelings of the mass of their subjects, that they were persons of a superior order, and more elevated nature.

Mordecai must have confided to the friendly eunuch the secret of Esther being a Jewess, for in the answer which he returned to her by him he told her that, as a general law for the destruction of the Jews had been issued, even the queen herself would not be exempted when her connection with the doomed nation was known—a view of the edict which Esther herself took, as is evident from her subsequent addresses to the king. He likewise informed her that if she "held her peace" at this time, and did not even

hazard her life to save her people, she and her family would be destroyed by the Jews themselves, if "deliverance and enlargement should arise to them from another place." Bishop Sanderson appropriately remarks, that "the argument used by Mordecai to Esther is one of general application and use, namely, that one great purpose for which men are entrusted by Providence with power or riches is, that they may therewith do good, and succour those who require their assistance—that they may help those to right who suffer wrong, may stand by their poorer brethren in the day of calamity, and may minister to the comfort of the afflicted—and that it is their sin, if they neglect to make these uses of their superior advantages." Esther, thus appealed to, could no longer resist, and she exhibited a noble example of patience, courage, generous resolution, and love to her nation. She evinced that life can never be better adventured than where it would be gain to lose it, and she prepared herself for the ordeal which awaited her, by piously resigning herself to the good providence of Him who rules the hearts of kings, and who exalts the humble and meek. She sent notice to Mordecai to assemble all the Jews who were in Shushan, and to enjoin them to observe a solemn fast for three days. "I also," she said, "and my maidens will fast likewise; and so will I go in unto the king, which is not according to law; and if I perish, I perish."

On the third day, when the trial was to be made which would decide the fate of the Jews, Esther arrayed herself in the costly royal apparel which belonged to her as queen, and attended by her women sought out the king in the sacred and most retired apartment of the palace, into which, she was well aware, that it was death even for her to enter unbidden. We are told that "she stood in the inner court of the king's house," obviously the more private residence of the king, for it would have been contrary to all rule if she had appeared at a public levee in the outer palace. Here Ahasuerus

was seated in state "upon his royal throne in the royal house," holding a levee similar to those which the modern kings of Persia constantly hold within the harem to determine the internal affairs of the royal establishment. It is also to be observed that in Persia the principal and most splendid apartment of the palaces is always open in front, unless closed by a curtain, so that the king, who is stationed at the upper end of the hall, with his face towards the court, has a complete view of the whole exterior. At these audiences the nobles and others stand in the open court, and never enter the hall until called by name—the royal princes and some high functionaries having exclusively the privilege of standing in the hall or in the portico. This explains the statement that the king saw Esther "standing in the court." This extraordinary appearance of his queen, dressed in her royal robes, which enhanced her surpassing loveliness, attracted the attention of Ahasuerus; she "obtained favour in his sight," and he "held out to her the golden sceptre that was in his hand." Trembling and diffident she approached and touched the top of the sceptre in a manner which gave additional interest to her beauty, yet with a joyful heart, for she now knew that her life at least was safe, and that she had not lost the affection of her powerful husband. She was farther encouraged by the question of the king—"What wilt thou, queen Esther, and what is thy request? It shall be even given thee to the half of the kingdom"—a phrase referring to a custom common with the ancient kings of Persia when they bestowed grants or pensions on favourites, which was not by payments from the royal treasury, but by charges upon the revenues of certain provinces and cities. Esther answered—"If it seem good unto the king, let the king and Haman come this day unto the banquet that I have prepared for him." The request was instantly granted, and Haman was ordered to attend. On this occasion, while the king and his minister were at the "banquet of wine" which

Esther had prepared, the former repeated his question, declaring that whatever she demanded would be granted to her—that “even to the half of the kingdom it would be performed.” Esther then answered—“My petition and my request is, If I have found favour in the sight of the king, and if it please the king to grant my petition, and to perform my request, let the king and Haman come to the banquet that I shall prepare for them, and I will do to-morrow as the king hath said.” She here intimated that she would then make known what she desired. Her intention in thus entertaining the king twice before she informed him of her petition was, that she might the more endear herself to him, and dispose him to accede to her important petition. At Esther’s special request also the banquet was to be strictly private—no one was to be present but the king and his ministers. This directs our attention to one of the very few usages which are relinquished in the modern Persian court, and indicates that in ancient times the queens of Persia were allowed greater liberty and were held in more respect than at present. No queen of Persia would think of inviting a man to her banquet, but it is probable that in the case of Esther it would not have been allowed if the king had not been included. As so much is said about banquets, and eating and drinking, in the Book of Esther, the following passage, inserted by Heeren from Athenæus, taken from an ancient author, Heraclides of Cumæ, gives an interesting illustration of the etiquette maintained at the royal banquets of the ancient Persian kings. “Those who wait on the king at table, being always freshly washed and handsomely dressed, pass nearly half the day in preparing his repast. As for the king’s guests, some of them dine without in a place where all may see them, others in the interior of the palace in his presence. Even these, however, do not properly dine with him, for there are two apartments over against one another, in one of which dines the king, and in the other his guests. The king sees them through

the curtain at the door, but they cannot see the king. On solemn occasions they sometimes dine all together in the great hall [as in the instance narrated in the first chapter of the Book of Esther]. When the king gives a banquet, which happens frequently, only twelve guests are invited. When the king and the guests provide severally their own dinners, the latter are called in by a eunuch, and when they are all assembled they drink wine with him, but not the same wine; they are seated on the floor, the king on a chair with golden feet, but it is usual for them to quit his presence intoxicated. Generally, however, the king dines alone, his consort [as in the history of Esther], or one of his sons, is occasionally admitted to his table, and damsels from the harem are accustomed to sing before him. The banquet of the king has the appearance of being very splendid, though, in fact, there reigns a great economy, as in the meals of all the grandees of Persia. A thousand victims are slaughtered every day for the palace, consisting of camels, oxen, asses, but especially sheep, together with a great abundance of fowl. A separate mess is set before every one of the king’s guests, and he takes away what he does not eat. By far the greater proportion of these victuals, as well as the bread, is destined to support the household of the court, the guards, &c., and is carried out to them in the courts, both meat and bread, which they receive as rations: for as the mercenary troops among the Greeks are paid in money, so are the king’s soldiers in food. The same is the case in the households of the grandees of Persia, and those of the governors of cities and provinces.”

Esther, by coupling Haman exclusively with the king in the invitation to her banquet, apparently paid to the minister a most flattering distinction, of which, unconscious of his own impending fate, he was duly sensible. We are told that he “went forth that day with a joyful heart.” It was, in reality, and in other circumstances, the greatest honour he

could receive, and the highest mark of favour which the queen-consort could bestow. On his way from the palace, exulting in his good fortune, and expecting great advantages from the compliment he had received, he encountered or passed Mordecai, who, however, "stood not up nor moved for him." If the proud Amalekite was exasperated against the Jew for not rendering him that homage which he received from others by command of the king, and which his own position would not fail to procure from assiduous flatterers, his indignation was excited to the highest pitch, now that he had been honoured in such a pre-eminent manner, and he seriously intended to dispatch this to him odious person on the spot, but he prudently "refrained himself," and curbed his wrath. When he entered his own palace, he assembled his friends, and his wife Zeresh from his harem, and told them of his riches, his numerous family, and the distinguished honours he had received above all the princes and servants of the king. "Yea," he continued, "Esther the queen did let no man come in with the king unto the banquet that she had prepared but myself, and to-morrow am I invited unto her also with the king; yet all this availeth me nothing, so long as I see Mordecai the Jew sitting at the king's gate." This was the rankling thorn which embittered his existence—the iron which entered his soul—the alloy which mingled with all his boasted prosperity, distinctions, and favours; and thus was this daily appearance of Mordecai made a source of bitterness and misery to Haman by his own passions and imagination. Even the certainty, as he conceived, of the destruction of Mordecai in the approaching massacre of the Jews was no consolation. He began to grow impatient at the delay, and he would have gladly rewarded any one most liberally who would have murdered the indomitable Hebrew. While thus expressing his wretchedness occasioned by the constant sight of Mordecai, his wife proposed to him a singular expedient

to rid himself of the disturber of his happiness, and all his friends sanctioned the proposal. "Let a gallows," she said, "be made of fifty cubits high, and to-morrow speak thou unto the king that Mordecai may be hanged thereon; then go thou in merrily with the king unto the banquet." We are told that this inhuman proposal pleased the wretched Haman, who trusted to his influence with the king to carry it into effect, and "he caused the gallows to be made."

Haman little expected the fate which awaited him, and that he was to undergo the ignominious punishment he had destined for Mordecai on the apparatus of death he had ordered to be constructed. But before that humiliating termination of his career a mortification was in reserve for him which drove him almost to despair, and in which he was compelled to be the principal agent. Ahassuerus passed a restless and sleepless night, and early in the morning, to amuse himself, he ordered the "book of records of the chronicles" to be read to him. The nature of this register is previously explained—that it formed rather the history of the court than of the empire, embracing many anecdotes of even the private life and sayings of the king, and from the incident in the text, it appears that the Persian monarchs had sometimes these journals read to them. It was a singular interposition of Divine Providence that among the voluminous occurrences which must have been recorded in these registers, the secretary should have turned to that part in which the discovery of the conspiracy of the two eunuchs by Mordecai was entered. Ahassuerus recollected well the circumstance, and the generosity of his nature, of which, notwithstanding his luxuriousness, and the influence of the despotism he exercised, he was not deficient, prompted him to stop the secretary, and to ask, "What honour and dignity have been done to Mordecai for this?" He was answered that there was nothing done for him, and that the good service he then rendered had been neglected or forgotten.

It was the custom then, as it still is, in Persia, to attend to the business of government very early in the morning, and levees are often held at an hour when the ministers of European sovereigns are probably enjoying their nightly rest. The king asked, "Who is in the court?" It happened that Haman on this, the morning of Esther's special banquet, had entered the outer court of the palace to obtain the royal sanction to put Mordecai to death "on the gallows he had prepared for him." The king was informed that his minister was in attendance, and ordered him to his presence. As soon as he had rendered the usual obeisance to his sovereign Haman was asked, "What shall be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honour?" The question was general, and apparently conveyed no particular meaning, yet Haman, who was that day to attend the banquet of the queen, failed not to apply it as intended for himself, connecting it with that high honour. The inference, considering all the circumstances, was natural, and in this belief he proposed the pageantry and display which ought to be exhibited in an affair of such distinction. "For the man," he said, "whom the king delighteth to honour, let the royal apparel be brought, which the king useth to wear, and the horse that the king rideth upon, and the crown royal which is set upon his head: and let this apparel and horse be delivered to the hand of one of the king's most noble princes, that they may array the man whom the king delighteth to honour, and bring him on horseback through the street of the city, and proclaim before him, Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honour."

This gorgeous proposal of the way in which the man ought to be rewarded whom "the king delighteth to honour," is an instance of the remarkable ambition of Haman in supposing that he was the person intended, otherwise he would have scarcely dared to suggest it, even from motives of policy, without any reference to the possibility of a rival being so dis-

tinguished. When the ancient kings of Persia presented to their favourites such robes as they wore themselves, and which none could wear but those on whom they were conferred, it was a permanent distinction of a high order; but it was death for any one to wear the king's *own* robe. It was also considered unlawful for any one to ride on the king's horse, to sit on his throne, or to use his sceptre. Many illustrations might be given of this peculiarly severe etiquette as it still exists in Oriental countries. When Ahasuerus assented to this extraordinary proposal, he sanctioned what was calculated to express the most pre-eminent favour and distinction which could be witnessed by all the people. It is alleged by some commentators that the "crown royal" refers to a similar decoration on the head of the horse, but although it is certain that horses when paraded in state, especially those belonging to the king, were in some way crowned, it rather appears that the turban, cap, or crown, which the monarch wore, is intended on this occasion. The Oriental crown is usually a cap more or less enriched with gems and gold, and sometimes bound about with a shawl; but it must not be supposed that the royal crown of Persia, or any other nation mentioned in the Scriptures, had any resemblance to those of Europe, which the learned Selden states did not come into use till about the age of Constantine. It is evident, from all the peculiarities of the proposal of Haman, especially with reference to the king's *own* or peculiar robe, that his ambition prompted him to aspire to one of the actual dresses of his master—not the Median or secondary dress merely, which, from his high situation, he must have possessed already—but one worn by the king himself, and consequently bestowed, when given at all, on his most distinguished and peculiar favourites.

Ahasuerus was apparently pleased with the proposal, but the astonishment of Haman may be easily conceived when he heard the king's reply:—"Make haste,

and take the apparel and the horse, as thou hast said, and do even so to Mordecai the Jew that sitteth at the king's gate; let nothing fail of all that thou hast spoken." It was not for himself, then, that he had proposed the highest honours and distinctions possible for a subject of the Persian Empire to receive, but for Mordecai the Jew, and that very Mordecai whose presence and conduct towards himself had embittered his days and made his nights wretched! To be the agent of honouring this man, and himself to have proposed those rewards for one whom he detested, and whose death he had plotted, was the most humiliating degradation he could receive, yet it was one to which he must submit, or forfeit his life. And what a transition from the object of hope to that of dread and alarm? He had gone that morning to the palace, never doubting that he would be able to procure the royal sanction to hang Mordecai on the gallows he had erected for that purpose; but he had scarcely appeared in the court of the royal residence when he was summoned to the presence of the king, and ordered to superintend the illustrious distinctions he had proposed for himself to be awarded to this obnoxious and hated Jew. But what had Mordecai done to deserve these or any marks of royal favour? It is possible that Haman was ignorant of the fact that the Jew had discovered the conspiracy of the two eunuchs, but he had at present no time to inquire, and he could obtain no information from the king, whose commands were summary, and not to be questioned or explained. Haman was necessitated to obey the king's injunction, and Mordecai was led about the city on horseback in the manner he had proposed, while the spectators rent the air with acclamations. After the pageant was concluded, Mordecai returned to his station at the king's gate, to perform the duties required from him, and to show that he was not elated with the high honour he had received. The unhappy Haman hastened to his own residence overwhelmed with grief, and related all the circumstances to his friends.

From them, however, he received little consolation. His wife Zeresh said to him, "If Mordecai be of the seed of the Jews, before whom thou hast begun to fall, thou shalt not prevail against him, but shalt surely fall before him." While listening to similar opinions the royal eunuchs arrived to convey him to the queen's banquet.

It will be readily supposed that Haman was not in a mood to enjoy what had appeared to him, and what it actually was in other circumstances, a distinguishing honour, and if he had been aware of the relationship of Esther and Mordecai, of which he was still ignorant, he would either have resigned himself to his inevitable fate, or have endeavoured to accomplish the ruin of the queen. But if he had even now been informed of that relationship, it was too late to attempt the latter alternative. The influence of Esther, who had previously not seen the king for thirty days, was powerful, and Haman's political and private enemies began to perceive the certain indications of his downfall. Every thing was subject to the control of the reigning queen, who was supported by the eunuchs of the royal household. "It is necessary to have studied," remarks a learned writer, "in the court history of Ctesias, the character and violent actions of an Amytis or Amestris, or, still more, a Parysatis, to form an adequate idea of the nature of such a harem government. None of the kings of Persia, with the single exception of Cambyses, appears to have had an innate proneness to cruelty, but the furious effects of female hatred and vengeance were not on that account a whit the less formidable; and it is impossible to read, without shuddering, the descriptions of the horrible and premeditated punishments which were executed at the command of the females of the royal family, when the sanction of the monarch had been obtained." These remarks have no direct application to Esther, for although Haman fell by her skilful contrivance, it was a righteous retribution ostensibly brought upon him by

his pride, bad passions, cruelty, and resentment. His hatred to an individual who had never injured him, who was not a rival in the king's favour, and of whom the king knew little or nothing, prompted him to procure one of the most cruel edicts on record, and to contrive the massacre of thousands throughout the empire, merely that he might ensure the destruction of one man. It is evident that if Haman had conducted himself with prudence in his high station, the beautiful Esther would never have exercised her influence against him; but it was now a matter of equity that the guilty contriver of a most unjustifiable massacre should perish, rather than the thousands of captives who were to be mercilessly plundered and destroyed.

At this banquet, so fatal to Haman, the king again addressed Esther—"What is thy petition, queen Esther, and it shall be granted thee? and what is thy request? and it shall be performed, even to the half of the kingdom." Now was the time for the incensed queen to make known her wrongs, and she did so in the most energetic and eloquent manner, which no less astonished the king than the evident appeal she made to his justice and generosity arrested his attention, and endeared her to his affections. "If I have found favour," she said, "in thy sight, O king, and if it please the king, let my life be given me at my petition, and my people at my request. For we are sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, to be slain, and to perish. But if we had been sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I had held my tongue, although the enemy could not countervail the king's damage"—namely, that the king would have lost more than he could have gained, if the Jews had been sold. Ahasuerus, whose despotic resentment was easily roused, could not resist this appeal, and hastily demanded—"Who is he, and where is he, that durst presume in his heart to do so?" "The adversary," replied the queen, emphatically, and expressing the most extreme grief, "is this wicked Haman."

The unhappy Haman heard this impeachment with unspeakable terror, while he dared not, and indeed he could not, attempt to offer a single observation in defence or explanation. He was now fully alive to his dreadful situation, and saw at once his inevitable ruin in a manner too palpable to be doubted. The king instantly rose from his couch in great wrath, and went into the palace garden, leaving Haman alone with the queen. The proud Amalekite "stood up to make request for his life to Esther," whose emotions had caused her to fall back as if fainting on her couch, "for he saw that there was evil determined against him by the king"—a circumstance which the attendant eunuchs also too plainly perceived. Haman saw that he had not only *cause* to apprehend evil, but that, in strict accordance with the prompt resolutions of Oriental despotism, the *evil was determined*, which he knew by the king rising and going out; and it is worthy of remark, that at the present time in Persia it is a signal of death to the offender, whatever may be his rank, when the king rises abruptly, and withdraws. The eunuchs would probably have seized Haman at the instant, if he had not entreated the queen to save his life. When the king returned to the apartment of the banquet, he perceived that "Haman was fallen upon the bed (couch) whereon Esther was," and, setting no limits to his passion, he furiously exclaimed, "Will he force the queen also before me in the house?" In the agony of his spirit he had fallen on his knees to embrace the feet of Esther in supplication, but the king interpreted this posture as if the unhappy Haman were so imprudent as to take liberties with the queen's person in his own palace. He could not have seriously believed this to be the case, but in his furious passion he turned every thing to the worst sense, and made it an aggravation of Haman's crime. There may, however, be something more in the incidents recorded than ostensibly appears. It is well known that it was a capital crime to sit on the royal seat, and it was

equally so even to touch any of the women of the harem, especially the queen-consort. Oriental jealousy and resentment for this unpardonable liberty and insult, offered in the most sacred part of the palace, were mingled with furious rage and exasperation. Immediately the attendant eunuchs, at the command of the king, "covered Haman's face." This impressive act intimated that he was now a criminal before the king, whose face he was no longer worthy to behold, and to receive from him his doom—an act anciently and still followed in many parts of the East, where offenders are brought to hear their sentence with their hands tied and their faces covered with a napkin or piece of cloth. Haman would have been instantly put to death, as was, and still is, the common practice in Persia and other countries, where criminals are rarely if ever carried to prison after they are condemned, but one of the eunuchs named Harbonah mentioned the instrument of death which Haman had prepared for Mordecai. The king ordered his miserable minister to be "hanged thereon," and he was hurried away to meet his awful doom. In the margin the word *gallows* is rendered *tree*, and Mr Bruce alleges that crucifixion was the punishment inflicted by Ahasuerus upon Haman, which, he says, is also one of the capital punishments in Abyssinia. Thus, within the compass of one day, was Haman's fortune completely reversed, and a few hours after he had imagined his success certain was the sentence of condemnation pronounced upon him, and the punishment inflicted. Nor did it excite any extraordinary surprise in the city of Shushan. Such is the nature of Oriental despotism, that a man by the mere caprice of the monarch may be suddenly deprived of the highest employments, have all his property confiscated, as was the case with Haman, and either put to death, or his eyes put out. The people calmly acquiesce in the procedure of their sovereign, and ascribe the fall of his favourite to the will of God.

We are told that the punishment of

Haman pacified the king, who presented Esther with all his confiscated property. She now told Ahasuerus her relationship to Mordecai, and reminded him that she was one of that nation which Haman had conspired to destroy. Mordecai appeared before the king, and was entrusted with the royal signet worn by his enemy, while Esther appointed him to superintend the forfeited property generously assigned to her. But the deliverance of the Jews from the edict procured by Haman was not yet accomplished. Esther again ventured to transgress the law, and appear unbidden before the king. The golden sceptre was held out to her as she fell at his feet, which entitled her to rise, and to plead the cause of her nation. She beseeched the king to reverse the edict issued by Haman against the Jews in the most urgent manner, "for how," she asked, "can I endure to see the evil that shall come unto my people? or how can I endure to see the destruction of my kindred?" Ahasuerus said to Esther and Mordecai, "Behold, I have given Esther the house of Haman, and him they have hanged upon the gallows, because he laid his hand upon the Jews. Write ye also for the Jews, as it liketh you in the king's name, and seal it with the king's ring; for the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's ring, may no man reverse." This was in the third month, called Sivan, or little more than two months after Haman's decree. The royal secretaries attended Mordecai, and wrote according to his directions that "the king granted the Jews of every city to gather themselves together, and to stand for their life, to destroy, to slay, and to cause to perish, all the power of the people and province that would assault them, both little ones and women, and to take the spoil of them for a prey, upon one day in all the provinces of king Ahasuerus, namely, upon the thirteenth day of the twelfth month, which is the month Adar." These instructions, written in the king's name, and sealed with the royal signet, were transmitted "by posts on horseback, and

riders on mules, camels, and young dromedaries," to all the rulers, governors, and lieutenants of the provinces, in the several languages of the different nations and tribes, that "the Jews should be ready against that day [the thirteenth of the month Adar] to avenge themselves on their enemies." As the decree procured by Haman by the absurd law of the Medes and Persians was irreversible, all that the king could do in compliance with Esther's request was to issue a new one, empowering the Jews to defend themselves in such a manner as might render the former decree ineffectual, from which it appears that if this new edict had not been issued, the Jews dared not have offered resistance to the former one, or even defend themselves.

Mordecai was in the meantime advanced to most distinguished honours. He no longer sat at the royal gate, but "went out from the king in royal apparel of blue (or violet) and white, and with a great crown of gold, and with a garment of fine linen and purple; and the city of Shushan rejoiced and was glad." Here we have evidently intimated the dress which Haman had recommended the king to give to the man whom he delighted to honour, and not the common Median dress, for the blue or purple and white dress was peculiar to royalty. The "great crown of gold" indicates not a royal crown, but a turban surrounded or wreathed with diadems, which, according to the testimony of Xenophon, was not peculiar to the king, but was allowed to his relations. The Jews participated in Mordecai's advancement, and had *light*, or prosperity, "and gladness, and joy, and honour;" and "in every province and in every city, whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came, the Jews had joy and gladness, a feast, and a good day. And many of the people of the land became Jews, for the fear of the Jews fell upon them."

This last mentioned fact plainly intimates that the plan for the destruction of the Jews on the day appointed had been very extensively organized, to which

many had doubtless promised their aid from the hope of spoil, and that now, when they ascertained the change of favourites at the court, they endeavoured to conciliate the people they had resolved to destroy. Mordecai had also become "great in the king's house, and his fame went throughout all the provinces" during the months which intervened between the promulgation of the second decree, which was the twenty-third of the month Sivan, and the thirteenth of the month Adar. On the latter day the Jews were found prepared to oppose their enemies, and to defend themselves, and they "gathered themselves together in their cities throughout all the provinces of king Ahasuerus, to lay hand on such as sought their hurt, and no man could withstand them, for the fear of them fell upon all people." So great was the revolution of public feeling in their favour, caused doubtless by the advancement of Mordecai, that the governors of the provinces and their subordinate officers were ready to assist them, resolving to embrace that opportunity of ridding themselves of sundry of their own obnoxious enemies. A dreadful slaughter took place. In Shushan the Jews put to the sword five hundred men, and the ten sons of Haman, who suffered their father's fate; but they refrained from appropriating the spoil to themselves. At the request of Esther the king granted another day of slaughter to the Jews in Shushan, and put three hundred more to the sword. Altogether throughout the provinces seventy-five thousand of the subjects of Ahasuerus were slain, after which they rested from the sanguinary conflict.

If this retaliating massacre was unprovoked, it can scarcely be justified under any circumstances. The decree procured by Haman empowered the people to exterminate the Jews on a certain day, and there can be little doubt that it was resolved to obey it to the letter; but if, on the other hand, the enemies of the Jews, as it is plainly intimated, took fright at the promulgation of the second edict, and made no

hostile movement, the proceedings of the Jews, although they were entitled to appear armed in their own defence, can only be held as a most barbarous and revengeful aggression. It is at the same time expressly stated that the Jews "stood for their lives," which certainly intimates that, notwithstanding the second edict, they were attacked by those on whom "the fear" of them had no influence, and such is apparently the inference intended to be drawn by the historian. Dr Hales observes—"It is probable that these persons were destroyed in consequence of their having obstinately persevered in measures of active hostility against the Jews, notwithstanding the change in the disposition of the king. On this occasion was displayed the mischievous effect of that absurd law of the Medes and Persians, that the king's decree, when signed by him, and sealed with his seal, could not be changed or repealed. For the king was obliged to issue a counter decree, empowering the Jews to take up arms in self-defence, and in consequence of this, 800 men were slain in Shushan, and in the provinces 75,000. Such was the calamitous consequence of a rash and unjust decree, ratified at a banquet, when 'the king and Haman sat down to drink, but the city of Shushan was perplexed.'"

This remarkable triumph over their enemies by the Jews was succeeded by a feast held by those in Shushan on the fifteenth, and by those in the provinces on the fourteenth, of the month Adar—the difference of a day in the celebration being caused by the metropolitan Jews having two days of slaughter. Those days were afterwards, at the suggestion of Mordecai and Esther, annually commemorated by the Jews, and were called Purim, from the word *Pur*, signifying *lot*, and the festival is celebrated at the present time.

This feast is one of those which in the progress of time the Jews instituted to commemorate certain remarkable occurrences in their history, but for which they had no authority in the law of Moses.

Such additional festivals and fasts were not at first admitted without dissentient voices, and, according to the Rabbinical writers referred to by Lightfoot, eighty-five elders protested against the feast of Purim as an unauthorised innovation; but it has nevertheless continued to occupy a conspicuous place in the Hebrew calendar. The month Adar corresponds with parts of our February and March, and Esther and Mordecai ordained the festival to be observed only on the fourteenth and fifteenth days, but the modern Jews observe, as they have long done, a fast on the thirteenth—the day destined by Haman for their extirpation. The Jews everywhere generally agreed to observe the injunction of Mordecai, and, to prevent the memorial of such a remarkable preservation from decaying in subsequent generations, the queen issued a second injunction on the subject. The festival has been always observed by a total rest from labour, by attendance on the synagogues, by sending presents to each other, giving food and other necessities to their poor, and by great rejoicings and demonstrations of happiness. In some countries where the Jews are numerous, they give way to riotous excesses and carousing, and the intimation has been faithfully followed, that a man should be so far gone in liquor on the festival of Purim, as a matter of duty, as to be unable to distinguish between—"Cursed be Haman! Blessed be Mordecai!" Lewis informs us that the most ridiculous extravagancies have been exhibited on these occasions—"Some would put on fools' coats, and rake like pickled herrings about the streets, and dance in the very synagogues while the Book of Esther was reading. Others disguised themselves in strange antic dresses—men in the habit of women, and women dressed like men, with their faces disfigured." On each day of the festival the Book of Esther, which must be written on vellum as a single roll, is read from beginning to end, and all Jews, whether men, women, children, or servants, are required to be present, because it is said they all

had a share in the deliverance obtained by Esther. Where the names of Haman's ten sons occur (Esther ix. 7-10), the reader pronounces them with great rapidity, as if in one breath, to intimate that they all expired at one time on a gibbet, and whenever Haman himself is mentioned they raise a terrible uproar in the synagogue, clapping their hands, stamping with their feet, and making every kind of turbulent noise, exclaiming, "Let his memory perish! Let his name be blotted out! Let the memory of the wicked rot!" The young Jews are also instructed to hiss at the same time, and to strike the wooden seats with mallets prepared for the occasion. When the reading is finished, they praise God who pleadeth the cause of his people, and the whole congregation pronounce alternately, with loud voices—"Cursed be Haman! Blessed be Mordecai! Cursed be Zeresh! Blessed be Esther! Cursed be all the wicked! Blessed be all the Jews! And blessed be Harbonah, at whose suggestion Haman was hanged." They also read in the synagogue some passages of the Pentateuch, relating to the perpetual enmity between the Israelites and the Amalekites. The synagogue is not open after the morning of the fourteenth, and the remainder of the festival is spent in rest and entertainment. At one time the Jews were accustomed to erect a gibbet, and burn the effigy of Haman upon it; but it was thought that in this they had also a covert intention of insulting Christians, and the Emperors prohibited this part of their ceremonies under the penalty of forfeiting all their privileges. It is said that it was also customary at one time to write Haman's name upon a great stone, and regarding the stone as his representative, they pelted it with other stones, till the writing was effaced, or the stone broken, exclaiming all the time, "Let his name be blotted out! Let his memory perish!"

It is fair to state that in our own country, in those cities where the Jews are numerous, the festival of Purim is celebrated by them with great hilarity,

but not, generally speaking, with greater excess than usually attends the festivities of Christmas among Christians, though there are of course among Jews, in proportion to their numbers, as there are among Christians, disorderly persons who indulge in intemperance and licentiousness, while instances have been known of their doctors inventing various excuses and pretences to justify the transgressions of the Law which are wantonly committed on these annual occasions. Mr Ilyam Isaacs, a converted Jew, says—"It is delightful to see the manner in which those who have it in their power keep the feast, which is generally in this manner. They keep open houses—poor and rich, young and old—all have free access to come and enjoy themselves. No questions are asked who they are, or what they are. At those times they are welcome guests, and many of them, both male and female, dress themselves or deck themselves in all kinds of gaudy dresses, similar to those of the chimney-sweepers going about on the first of May in London; and formerly they acted a play. Even in this kingdom they erected temporary buildings as late as within my recollection, and their performance was a representation of the history of king Ahasuerus, Mordecai, Esther, Haman, &c.; but this custom is now abolished. No doubt it has been remarked by the world at large that the Jews are not much addicted to drunkenness, for the Talmud tells them that a drunken man is worse than a swine, because a swine will drink no more than his fill, and therefore a man is in duty bound to do the same. But on the day of Purim the Rabbins say that a man may enjoy himself on this wise;—he may drink as much, and no more, as will enable him to know the difference between gold and silver, wood and stone!" If the Jews act according to the toleration of the Rabbins, it is easy to comprehend the fearful intoxication in which they have a licence to indulge from their religious teachers on this annual occasion. This converted Hebrew admits that "there is more feasting on the Purim

than on any other festival, for the Rabbinical writings teach them that when the Messiah comes all festivals will be abolished except that of Purim."

The last chapter of the canonical Book of Esther, which consists of only three verses, contains merely a general intimation of the power and might of Ahasuerus, and the greatness of Mordecai, who was "next unto king Ahasuerus, and great among the Jews, and accepted of the multitude of his brethren, seeking the wealth of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed." The additions to the Book of Esther in the Apocrypha are entitled to very limited credit, and appear to be embellishments of the canonical history, and insertions of such traditional circumstances as the author could furnish. These Apocryphal chapters are not extant in the Hebrew or Chaldee, and are only found in the Greek and Latin copies. It is more than doubtful whether they ever existed in the Hebrew language, and it is certain that they were never admitted into the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is evident that the canonical Book is complete and perfect, and the Apocryphal chapters are superfluous and cumbrous additions, written in a different style from the authentic chapters, and in part consist of particulars contained in them. Thus, the first chapter, which in the Greek copies is annexed to the tenth of the canonical Book, consists of an interpretation of a pretended dream of Mordecai, who is designated by the Greek name *Mardocheus*, and was probably furnished by the person who fabricated his dream of two dragons coming to fight, and of a little fountain which became a great water, in the chapter following. The account of the contrivances of the two eunuchs who conspired against Ahasuerus, and the discovery by Mordecai, is a repetition of what is related in the canonical Book (ii. 21-23). The same observations apply to the other parts of it, which contain a series of fictitious inventions intended to decorate and complete the history. Haman is noticed as a *Macedonian*, and

Josephus suggests that *Amalekite* is intended, which corresponds with *Agagite*; or perhaps, as Calmet conjectures, the term *Macedonian* may be used generally for a stranger or foreigner, since the Apocryphal additions were probably written at a time when all Asia was filled with the fame of the Macedonian nation.

After the transactions recorded in the canonical Book of Esther, nothing is known of the beautiful queen of Ahasuerus and Mordecai. The alleged tomb of these distinguished persons is preserved at Hamadan, the ancient Ecbatana, one of the seats of the court of Persia, and the Jews, who, from the time of their captivity, always abounded in this region, have invariably regarded it as the real tomb of the Jewish queen and her relative. The existence of this tomb has in consequence rendered Hamadan a place of pilgrimage to the Jews from the time of Esther, and numbers of them are resident there. The tomb exhibits a bell-shaped dome on the exterior, and the entrance to the oblong building is by a stone door of small dimensions, the key of which is always kept by the chief rabbi. In the outer apartment or antichamber are the graves of several rabbins, and in the midst of the tomb chamber, which is larger than the other apartment, are the sarcophagi of Esther and Mordecai, of dark and hard wood, in good preservation, though evidently very old, richly carved, and having a Hebrew inscription along the upper ledge taken from the Book of Esther (ii. 5; x. 3). Sir Robert Ker Porter inserts in his *Travels* free translations of the Hebrew inscriptions, which in general terms express the pious humility of Esther and Mordecai, their confidence in God, and their gratitude to Him for delivering them from all their afflictions. The present building is said to occupy the site of a more magnificent one destroyed by Timour, and was erected in its place soon afterwards by certain devout Jews. It was subsequently repaired by a Rabbi named Ismael, but it is described as again falling to decay.

The history of Esther suggests some very suitable practical reflections; for, though the name of God is not mentioned throughout the narrative, his superintending Providence is admirably illustrated, disconcerting evil designs, and producing great events by means seemingly inadequate. A passage from the eloquent Dr Isaac Barrow, however, forms a more comprehensive conclusion to the preceding history than any private remarks which might be offered. "When," says this distinguished theologian, "iniquitous enterprises, managed by subtlety or violence, are suddenly and seasonably defeated, then the ever-vigilant eye and the all-powerful hand of Heaven are concerned. God doth ever see the deceitful workers of iniquity, though they devise their wickedness in secret. He often doth suffer it to grow on to a pitch of maturity till it be thoroughly formed, till it be ready to break forth in fearful effects, and then in a moment he crusheth it to nothing. God beholdeth unjust men setting out in their designs—He letteth them proceed in full career till they are reaching the object of their wishes—then He instantly checketh—He turneth them back—He overthroweth them. Thus was Haman's plot confounded, when he had procured a royal decree—when he had fixed a time—when he had issued forth letters to destroy the people of God. Thus was Pharaoh overwhelmed when he had just overtaken the children of Israel. Thus perished the designs of Abimelech, of Absalom, of Adonijah, of Sanballat. Thus, when Sennacherib had encamped against Jerusalem with a mighty host, and to all appearance had the city in his power, the Lord did put a hook in his nose, and turned him back into his own land. Almighty God could prevent the very beginning of wicked designs, or could subvert them in any stage of their progress, but he rather winketh for a time at their success, and suffereth the designers to go on till they are elevated to the height of confidence, and till the good are on the brink of ruin—then surpris-

ingly he striketh in with effectual succour, thus declaring how vain is the presumption of the ungodly—how needful and how certain is his protection over his good and faithful servants—how much reason the one hath to dread, and the other to confide in Him."

EUBULUS, a companion and coadjutor of St Paul, who is mentioned as sending his greeting to Timothy. He was with the Apostle at Rome when he wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy from that city.

EVE, the mother of the human race, was so called by Adam, "because she was the mother of all living." Her formation is thus recorded by the inspired historian:—"The Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone. I will make him an help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept, and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from the man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man." Thus was marriage divinely instituted by Jehovah in the state of primeval innocence—that state, above all others, most emblematical of such a sacred relationship, and then was the Divine ordinance enjoined—"Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife"—as if, says Bishop Patrick, they "were but one person, and had but one soul and body—an obligation arising from the singular union of the flesh of our first parents, one of whom was taken out of the other." It was after the Fall from the primeval state of innocence that Adam called his wife's name Eve. He had before called her *woman*, the common name for her and her sex, because she was taken out of man, but now he called her Eve, because he found she was still to be the "mother of all living." This naming of Eve after the Fall may also be viewed as an *act of faith*, exer-

cised by Adam upon the words of God delivered in the sentence of the serpent.

The particulars recorded of Eve are scanty, and, with the exception of the narrative of the temptation in Paradise, these are of little interest. The Rabbins and others relate many fanciful traditions and stories of the "mother of all living," some of them curious, others absurd, and all partaking of the marvellous. See ADAM.

EVIL-MERODACH, or, as his name implies, *Foolish Merodach*, was the son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar in the throne of Babylon. Immediately on his succession to the throne he released Jehoiachim, king of Judah, from the imprisonment in which he had languished for thirty-seven years, admitted him to the hospitality of his palace, assigned him an annual provision, and gave him precedence of all the kings who were at Babylon, Jer. lli. 31. There is a Jewish tradition mentioned by Jerome which is not improbable—though Jewish tradition is a very unsatisfactory authority—that Evil-Merodach, during his father's insanity, acted as regent, and administered the affairs of the empire in such a faulty manner, that on the restoration of Nebuchadnezzar to 'reason he was cast into the same prison with Jehoiachim, and on this occasion a lasting friendship was contracted between them. Berosus, cited by Eusebius, informs us that when he assumed the government he became a tyrant, and was assassinated in the second year of his reign by his brother-in-law Nereglissor, B.C. 561. Jehoiachim must have died before this, for it is expressly stated that he ate at the table of Evil-Merodach as long as he lived.

EUUNICE, the mother of Timothy, mentioned by St Paul in the most commendatory manner, 2 Tim. i. 5. She was a Jewess, and educated her son with great care in her own religion, before she became a convert to the Christian faith, Acts xvi. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 15. See TIMOTHY.

EUODIAS, a member of the Philipian church, mentioned by St Paul, Phil.

iv. 2. It is generally understood that this was a female, and the most of manuscripts read *Euodiam* in the feminine, but nothing is known of Euodias beyond the mere mention of the name. Some Greek manuscripts, on the contrary, read *Euodum*, or *Euodium*, in the masculine.

EUTYCHUS, a young man whom St Paul restored to life after he had been "taken up dead." This incident occurred at Troas.

EZEKIEL, the third of the great Prophets, was, like his contemporary Jeremiah, of the sacerdotal race. He was the son of Buzi, of the house of Aaron, and was one of the captives carried by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon with king Jehoiachim. He commenced his prophecies in the fifth year of the reign of Jehoiachim, or of Zedekiah, B.C. 593, while Jeremiah prophesied at the same time in Judea. After his captivity he resided on the banks of the river Chebar, which flows into the Euphrates about two hundred miles northward from Babylon. This was the scene of his remarkable predictions, though he was occasionally conveyed in vision to Jerusalem, and his prophecies were continued about twenty-two years. The *thirtieth year*, which he gives as the date of his first prophecy, is supposed by some to be the year of his own age. The events of Ezekiel's life, after his advancement to the Prophetical office, are considerably interwoven with the detail he gives of his predictions, and the manner of its termination is nowhere ascertained. Epiphanius, who is the reputed author of a life of this Prophet, informs us that he was put to death by the prince or ruler of the Jews, on account of his severe denunciations of idolatry, to which that functionary was addicted; but no reliance can be placed on this account, which is intermixed with many fables. The alleged tomb of Ezekiel is situated a few miles to the south-east of the ruins of Babylon, and it has always been believed by the Jews, numbers of whom remained in this region, to be the identical tomb of the Prophet. If we are to credit this

uninterrupted tradition, it is probable that Ezekiel died while on a visit to Babylon. "The place," says Benjamin of Tudela, "is holy even unto this day: and unto that place at a certain time many assemble for the cause of prayer, from the beginning of the year unto the feast of expiation, and there they live most pleasant days. And their principal man, whom they call the Prince of the Captivity, with the other heads of the assemblies, come hither also from Bagdad, and abide all in that field for two and twenty miles together. Moreover, the Arabian merchants come thither, and the greatest and most frequented fairs are kept there; but at this time a great book, renowned for authority and antiquity, written by Ezekiel the Prophet, is brought forth, wherein they read on the day of expiation, and upon the sepulchre of Ezekiel a lamp continually burneth day and night. Vows are made in that place to be performed by the Jews dwelling in Media and Persia. The principal men of the Ishmaelites resort hither to pray, among whom the authority of the Prophet Ezekiel is great." A recent traveller (Sir John Macdonald Kinnear) describes this venerated tomb as "a large clumsy building, without beauty or ornament; and, like the tomb of Ezra on the banks of the Tigris, a short way above Kornah, is much frequented by the Jews."

The subjects of Ezekiel's prophecies, according to their immediate and literal sense, are the calamities afterwards inflicted on Judea and Jerusalem for the idolatries and unbelief of the Jews—the Divine judgments which would be executed on the false prophets and others who deluded and hardened the Jews in their rebellion against God—the punishments which would befall the Ammonites, Edomites, and Philistines, for their hatred of the Jews, and for insulting them in their distresses—the destruction of Tyre—the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar—the restoration of Israel and Judah from their several dispersions after their repentance and reformation—and their ultimately happy state after the

advent and under the government of the Messiah. The visions of Ezekiel, particularly those with which the Book opens and terminates, have been always regarded both by Jews and Christians as very abstruse, and of such difficult interpretation, that the former anciently prohibited them to be read by any person under thirty years of age.

The style and manner of this Prophet are marked by a peculiar character, which is easily distinguishable even in a translation. Grotius speaks in high terms of Ezekiel, and observes that "he had great erudition and genius, so that, setting aside his gift of prophecy which is incomparable, he may deserve to be classed with Homer on account of his beautiful conceptions, his illustrious comparisons, and his extensive knowledge of various matters, particularly of architecture." But the most eloquent description of the peculiar and discriminating characteristics of this Prophet is given by Bishop Lowth in his twenty-first Lecture on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews. "Ezekiel is much inferior to Jeremiah in elegance, but is equal even to Isaiah in sublimity, though their style of composition is very different; for he is bold, vehement, tragical, wholly intent on exaggeration; in his sentiments elevated, warm, indignant; in his images fertile, magnificent, harsh, and sometimes almost deformed; in his diction grand, mighty, austere, rough, and sometimes uncultivated, abounding in repetitions, not for the sake of ornament or gracefulness, but through indignation and violence. Whatever subject he undertakes to treat of he pursues it diligently; he remains entirely fixed to it, and rarely deviates from his purpose, so that his reader is scarcely ever unable to discern the sense and connection of his matter. Perhaps he is excelled in other respects by most of the Prophets, but none in the whole compass of writers has ever equalled him in the manner of writing, for which he seems to have been singularly qualified by nature, in force, impetuosity, weight, and grandeur. His diction is sufficiently

perspicuous ; almost all his obscurity lies in his matter ; his visions are particularly obscure, and yet, as in Hosea, Amos, and Zechariah, they are interpreted by a narrative which is plain and altogether historical. The greater part of Ezekiel, and what lies in the middle of his Book, is poetical, whether we regard the matter or the diction ; but he is for the most part so rude and void of composition in his sentences, that I am often doubtful what to determine in this respect." The same learned writer remarks in another place that Ezekiel should perhaps be oftener classed among the orators than the poets ; and he thinks that with respect to style we may justly assign to him the same rank among the Hebrews which Æschylus holds among the Greeks. This estimate, however, has been objected to by some critics, particularly Michaëlis, who contends that Ezekiel is not equal to Isaiah in sublimity ; but Archbishop Newcombe properly observes, in reference to such discussions about style and manner, that the holy Prophet is not to be considered merely as a poet, or as a framer of those august and astonishing visions, and of those admirable poetical representations which he committed to writing, but as an instrument in the hand of God, who vouchsafed to reveal himself through a long succession of ages, not only in divers parts constituting a magnificent and uniform whole, but also in divers manners, as by a voice, by dreams, by inspiration, and by plain or enigmatical vision.

The praise of this Prophet is celebrated by the son of Sirach among the other illustrious worthies of the Hebrew nation who " were honoured in their generations, and were the glory of their times," and who " have left a name behind them, that their praises might be reported."—" It was Ezekiel," he says, " who saw the glorious vision, which was showed upon the chariot of the cherubim ; for he made mention of the enemies under the figure of rain [viz. what was to befall the enemies of Jehovah, Ezek. xiii. 11-13], and directed them that went right."

EZRA, or ESDRAS, a distinguished Jewish priest, was a descendant of the high priest Seraiah, who was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar at the capture of Jerusalem. He was probably born in the country of the Captivity, and became celebrated among the Jews for his learning, and his zeal for the Mosaic ritual. In the year B.C. 458, and in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, Ezra received his commission to return to Jerusalem with as many of the Jews as chose to accompany him, for the purpose of restoring that city and the Jewish state, and of regulating and governing it according to its peculiar laws. The extraordinary powers with which Ezra was invested are conjectured to have been conferred upon him by the influence of Esther. At the commencement of his important journey he appointed a fast to implore the Divine Protection on his undertaking, and he set out with a caravan which, including women and children, amounted to about six thousand persons. After a journey of three months and two weeks the new colony arrived at Jerusalem, and Ezra delivered his credentials to the royal officers of that district, depositing at the same time the donations he had received for the Temple.

The first Hebrew colony under Zerubabel, whom Ezra succeeded in the government, seems never to have attained a very flourishing condition. The administration of justice was particularly defective, and neither the civil nor the religious institutions were firmly established. Ezra held a commission to appoint judges, to rectify abuses, to enforce the observance of the Law, and to punish the refractory with fines, imprisonment, and death, according to the nature of their offences. From the whole tenor of the letter it is manifest that Jehovah was held in the highest veneration in the Persian court long after the time of Cyrus. Ezra had permission to make a collection among those Hebrews who chose to remain in the country of their exile for restoring the Temple, and the king and his counsellors not only contributed

liberally towards the same object, but the ministers of the royal revenues west of the Euphrates were ordered to supply him with what he should require—of silver, to the amount of one hundred talents, and a suitable proportion of wheat, wine, oil, and salt—to the end that the sacrifices might be regularly and lawfully offered to avert the wrath of God from the king and his empire. All those who were employed in the services of the Temple, even the common labourers (Nethinim), were exempted from tribute, and thus placed on an equality with the Medes and Persians. This was done to induce the priests and Levites to settle at Jerusalem, for as yet few of them had returned. Yet although exemption from tribute was secured to the Levites who would return to Judea, none of this tribe were found in the caravan which assembled in Babylonia, on the banks of the unknown river Ahava, and it was with difficulty that Ezra induced two families of priests to accompany him.

Ezra persevered in his difficult and arduous task during thirteen years after his arrival at Jerusalem, until Nehemiah arrived with a new commission from the Persian court to co-operate with him. Of all the regulations and improvements which he introduced into Judea, the Book which bears his name mentions only the dissolution of those marriages which the Hebrews had contracted with strange women—a measure necessary to prevent a relapse into idolatry; but Nehemiah informs us that Ezra also caused the Law to be publicly read to the people, and explained by interpreters to those who did not understand their original language. The preparations for this were conducted in the most solemn manner. The day appointed for the first public reading of the Law, after Ezra had completed his revision of it, was the first day of the feast of trumpets, when the commencement of the new year was joyfully celebrated. He ascended a platform erected in the most convenient part of the city, attended by thirteen of the principal elders of the people, and began

reading the Law from the Hebrew text, while some of the Levites, instructed and appointed for the purpose, rendered it into Chaldee, then the common language of the people. In this manner he proceeded day after day during the festival, and also during the feast of tabernacles, till the whole Law was finished. At the close of this solemnity, by which the minds of the people had been much impressed, Ezra, in conjunction with Nehemiah, who had superseded him in the commission, proclaimed a fast, to give them an opportunity of publicly confessing their sins, and of expressing their future obedience to what had been explained to them.

The subsequent events of Ezra's life are not recorded, but many stories are related of him by the Talmudists, some of which are borrowed by the Mahometans. It is not known when or where he died, but we know that he was alive in the second year of Nehemiah's government, on the important occasion just mentioned, which is the last time he is noticed in Scripture. Josephus says that he died and was buried at Jerusalem, but this is contrary to the general opinion of the Jews, who allege that he died at Zanzuma, a town on the Tigris, in the 120th year of his age, when on his way from Jerusalem to Shushan to have an interview with Artaxerxes on the affairs of the Jews. Accordingly, a tomb always supposed to be Ezra's, to which both Jews and Mahometans make pilgrimages, stands upon the banks of the Tigris, about twenty miles above the junction of that river with the Euphrates. It is a building like a mosque, enclosed with a strong and high wall erected on the west side of the river, the banks of which are here very low, and so near that the wall almost juts into the stream. The dome, which is elegant and highly enriched, rises high from the centre of the enclosure, and is surmounted by a symbolical gilt ornament, representing an open hand within a rayed circle. The whole structure is of kiln-burnt bricks, but the cupola has the exterior face of its

outer course of bricks coloured with a bright turquoise blue enamel. "The interior," says a visitor in 1832, "is divided into two apartments. The first of these is a large and lofty arched hall, which offers nothing remarkable except two inscriptions in the Hebrew character upon two dark-grey tablets over the entrance to the second chamber, which are scarcely legible from the ground on account of the height and the darkness of the stone. The second chamber is the cell containing the tomb, over which the cupola rises. This apartment is fourteen paces by ten in breadth. In the centre of this room appears the sarcophagus, which is a sort of ark or chest of very hard and dark wood, and is of an oblong figure, eight feet by four, with a four-sided slanting roof, the top of which is rather more than six feet from the ground. Large gilt cones are placed at the apex and corners of the roof. The whole is covered with a pall of dark green velvet fringed with gold. The pall is much faded, soiled, and worn, by the kisses of the pilgrims, and its fringe reduced by the threads pilfered to be preserved as relics. Around the upper rim of the sarcophagus, below the roof, runs a Hebrew inscription in wooden letters, nailed on with brass nails, giving the genealogy of Ezra. The cell is lighted by four small elliptical openings in the collar of the cupola. At one end of the cell is a small niche, in which a lamp is kept burning, and two candles are also lit when pilgrims arrive.—The veneration of the Jews for this spot, which is now far distant from any town, in a region which once teemed with a settled population, leads them to incur great danger and hardships to visit it. The present is one of the many instances in which the Jews continue to manifest that strong veneration for the real or supposed tombs of their prophets, to which there are some allusions in the New Testament."

There are four Books which pass under the name of *Ezra*, namely, the one properly so called, of which he was the author—that of *Nehemiah*, reckoned the

Second Book of *Ezra* by the ancient Jews, and still considered as such by the Greek and Latin Churches—and those in the Apocrypha, called in ecclesiastical language the Third and Fourth Books of *Esdras*, publicly read in the Greek Church, and received by many of the Fathers as a respectable work, but never of equal authority with the canonical Book. As it respects the two Apocryphal Books, the one is merely an interpolated copy of the authentic Book of *Ezra*, and the other is a manifest forgery—both consisting of combined extracts from the genuine *Ezra*, Rabbinical fables, and the dreams of some Christian visionary. As to the Book of *Nehemiah*, which the Jews ascribe to *Ezra*, the statement is contradicted by *Nehemiah's* own declaration at the commencement of it, and by his always speaking of himself in the first person. Some have conjectured that *Ezra* was the author of the Book of *Esther*, and many have, with greater probability, attributed to him the compilation of the Books of *Chronicles*; others also ascribe to him the two Books of *Kings*. The canonical Book of *Ezra* was written partly in Hebrew, and partly in Chaldee—from iv. 8, to vi. 13, and vii. 12–26, which are the Chaldean portions. Some conceive that the first six chapters were composed by a different person, chiefly from what is stated in the fifth chapter, wherein the author speaks of himself as having been present at Jerusalem in the time of *Darius Hystaspes*, whereas *Ezra* did not proceed thither till the reign of *Artaxerxes*, fifty years later. The first person being used in the early chapters, as, "*We said unto them,*" leads us to infer that the circumstances which took place before *Ezra* arrived at Jerusalem were copied by him from the documents he found, which may have been prepared by the Prophets *Haggai* and *Zechariah*, who appear to have returned with the first caravan in the time of *Cyrus*. The Book of *Ezra* contains a compendious history of the Jews for the period of ninety-two years, namely, from the first year of the reign of *Cyrus*

to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.

But Ezra is most interesting to us as the acknowledged arranger of the canon of the Old Testament—a tradition which the Jews have always maintained, and in which the Christian Church has universally concurred. The former regard him as a second Moses, in reference to this and his other labours, and assert that the Law given by Moses was revived and restored by him, after it had been almost extinguished in the Captivity. Dr Prideaux gives a full and learned account of the work which Ezra is admitted to have performed, and to this learned writer the reader is referred. The conclusions of this distinguished scholar are as follows:—1. Ezra corrected all the errors which had crept into previous copies through the negligence or mistakes of transcribers. 2. He collected together all the Books of which the Holy Scriptures then consisted, and

disposed them in proper order, settling the Canon of Scripture for his time. 3. He added in several places throughout the various Books what appeared necessary for illustrating, connecting, or completing them, wherein he was assisted by the same Holy Spirit by whose influence they were at first written. 4. He changed the old names of several places grown obsolete. 5. He wrote the whole in the Chaldee character, which had come exclusively into use during the Captivity, although the old Hebrew, then relinquished, was retained by the Samaritans in their copies of the Law, and it has been preserved through them to the present day. Dr Prideaux discusses the often disputed question, whether Ezra added the vowel points, as was long generally believed, and arrives at a negative conclusion, in which he is supported by the great majority of modern writers.

F

FELIX, the freedman of the Emperor Claudius, was appointed Procurator of Judea, A.D. 53, in the twelfth year of his reign. It is uncertain how long he held the office, but according to the Evangelical historian (Acts xxiv. 10) he had been Procurator many years. Tacitus asserts that Felix was placed over the Samaritans in the time of Ventidius Cumanus, his predecessor, who was Procurator from A.D. 47 to A.D. 53, and that each of those officers sent out bands of robbers against each other; but Josephus, who was alive at the time, makes no allusion to such a circumstance, and says that the Galileans complained of the Samaritans before the time of Cumanus, who was their ruler. He also affirms that Felix was Procurator of Judea for some time under Nero.

When Felix arrived in Judea he found the country full of robbers, false prophets, and impostors, who deluded the people by promises of great events. Some o.

the robbers he took prisoners, and crucified them. He invited one Eleazar, who had infested the country twenty years at the head of a band of adventurers, to visit him under a solemn promise of security; but as soon as he arrived he was put in chains, and sent to Rome. Scarcely had he suppressed the robbers in some degree when a new set of assassins appeared, called *Sicarii*, from the *sica*, or short dagger which they used, and soon became more formidable than the robbers. They carried their short daggers under their garments, and by mingling in crowds dispatched their victims, concealing themselves among the multitude. In this manner they committed numerous murders, and escaped detection; and they not only murdered their own enemies, but willingly performed the same service for others who chose to hire them, and pay them for the purpose. They scrupled not to commit murders even in the Temple, and Josephus ascribes

the Divine wrath against Jerusalem to the odious crimes of those men. Among other persons of distinction they assassinated the high priest Jonathan, who had solicited the Emperor to give Felix the procuratorship, and was now continually obtruding his advice upon that functionary regarding the administration of the government. Felix became weary of his well meaning monitor, and bribed Doras, the intimate friend of Jonathan, to hire the Sicarii to silence him, and the murderers were allowed to go unpunished. Besides the Sicarii, the robbers again recovered their strength, and many impostors and false Messiahs appeared, persuading the credulous people to follow them into the Wilderness, where they promised to show them signs and miracles. They were followed by many, but some of them fell into the hands of the soldiers sent after them by Felix, and were brought back and crucified. An Egyptian Jew was principally notorious among the impostors of that age. He came to Jerusalem, assumed the character of a prophet, and persuaded about thirty thousand men to follow him to the Mount of Olives, whence they would see the walls of Jerusalem fall down at his command, the Roman garrison expelled, and freedom restored. Felix attacked this deluded multitude with his troops, killed about four hundred of them, and took two thousand prisoners, but the impostor saved himself by flight. The robbers, however, were not restrained from inciting the people to rebellion by these examples. They maintained that it was unlawful to acknowledge the authority of the Romans, and wherever their seditious proposals were adopted the country was laid waste.

These particulars, and a few others of less moment, respecting Felix, are preserved by Josephus. In A.D. 60, Felix was accused at Rome by the Jews of Cæsarea, and he would have probably been condemned and punished, if his brother Pallas, who had great influence with the Emperor, had not interceded in his behalf. He was recalled, and his government given to Porcius Festus.

In private life, as well as in public, the conduct of Felix was marked by cruelty, avarice, and licentiousness. Although he had two wives, he became attached to Drusilla, sister of Herod Agrippa, and by means of one Simon, a sorcerer, he made her offers of marriage, and obtained her hand. It was before him and Drusilla that St Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come"—subjects not more remarkable for their importance than for their particular suitableness in regard to the persons to whom they were addressed. Felix trembled during the Apostle's discourse, and when it was concluded, exclaimed, "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee." The Apostle was not ill treated by Felix during his confinement, who, it appears, expected to receive money from him to procure his release; but "after two years Porcius Festus came into Felix' room, and Felix, willing to show the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound." For this, it has been already seen, the Jews were not grateful. As soon as he was recalled by the Emperor Nero the Jews of Cæsarea preferred complaints against him, from the consequences of which he escaped with difficulty.

FESTUS, or PORCIUS FESTUS, the successor of Felix in the procuratorship of Judea, A.D. 60. He found the country full of robbers, who laid it waste with fire and sword, and the Sicarii were numerous and daring. Festus sent a body of horse and foot against a false Messiah who had promised deliverance to all who should follow him into the Wilderness. This impostor and his deluded followers were slain. Festus died about A.D. 63. St Paul designated this governor "most noble Festus," when denying the imputation of madness.

FORTUNATUS, a coadjutor of St Paul, who survived him a considerable time, for it appears, from Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, that he was the messenger of the church in Corinth to that in Rome, by whom Clement sent that epistle.

G

GAD, a Prophet who flourished in the reign of David. See **DAVID**.

GAIUS, a Macedonian, and "of Derbe," was baptized by St Paul at Corinth, and he entertained the Apostle as his guest while he remained in that city, 1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. vi. 23. He is supposed to be the same person to whom St John addressed his Third Epistle, but of this there is no certainty. The commendation of his hospitality seems to imply that he was in a private station, and that he was possessed of some substance.

GALLIO was the elder brother o. Seneca the philosopher, by whom he is praised for his great mildness of disposition. He was originally called Marcus Annæus Novatus, but being adopted by Lucius Junius Gallio, he took his name. He was deputy of Achaia when the Jews excited a disturbance against St Paul, and dragged him before the tribunal, saying, "This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the Law." The Apostle was about to speak in defence or explanation, when Gallio replied to the Jews, "If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, reason would that I should bear with you; but if it be a question of words and names, and of your Law, look ye to it, for I will be no judge of such matters." In this manner he dismissed the complaint. We are told that "Gallio cared for none of those things," and some have foolishly inferred from this observation that he was indifferent to religion, whereas he evidently determined that he would not make himself a judge to decide upon the essential points of variance between the Jews and Christians, as whether Jesus was the Messiah, and other essential matters.

GAMALIEL, the preceptor of St Paul, was commonly called Rabbi Gamaliel—a title of the highest eminence, and given, the Jews tell us, to only seven

persons, which shows his reputation among the people. He was the son of the pious old Simeon who took Christ in his arms when an infant, and hailed him by inspiration as the promised Saviour. In his celebrated speech to the Sanhedrim, of which he was a member, he gave a decided opinion in favour of the Apostles and their converts, partly, we may suppose, from conviction, and partly from opposition, being a Pharisee, to the ruling sect of the Sadducees, which produced a considerable change in the opinions of the more influential persons of Jerusalem. After alluding to two famous leaders of formidable factions, Theudas and Judas of Galilee, he concluded—"And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men [the Apostles], and let them alone, for if this council or this work be of men it will come to nought, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." At this period the Christian religion was making rapid progress among the priests, many of whom submitted to the faith soon after, Acts vi. 7; and also among the Pharisees, whom we find among the Judaizing teachers of the Church, and who, on a future occasion, supported St Paul against the Sadducees in council upon the very plea urged by Gamaliel, Acts xv. 5; xxii. 3; xxiii. 9.

GEHAZI. See **ELISHA**.

GERSHOM, or **GERSHON**, one of the sons of Levi, and the head of a principal family of the Levites. Also, the name of a son of Moses, Exod. ii. 22.

GIDEON, also called **JERUBBAAL**, a distinguished Hebrew, and one of the worthies mentioned by St Paul in his admirable discourse on faith, Heb. xi. 32, was of the family of Abiezer, of the tribe of Manasseh. The defeat and death of Sisera by Deborah and Barak secured a peace of forty years for the Israelites,

when the Midianites united with the Amalekites and other nomade Arabs, and during seven years poured into Palestine in great numbers. With their numerous herds they trampled down all the fields, gardens, and vineyards, without distinction, seized the cattle, plundered men and houses, and rioted in the country after the manner of the Bedouin Arabs of the present day when not restrained by force. This severe chastisement, the duration of which is not mentioned, was evidently more distressing than any thing which had occurred to the Hebrews since their settlement in the Promised Land, and such was the consequence of their usual relapse into idolatry. They at length "cried unto the Lord, because of the Midianites," and a prophet was sent to expostulate with them on the folly of their previous conduct. The hero who was employed or authorised by Jehovah to deliver them from this oppression was Gideon, whose residence was at Ophrah in the half-tribe of Manasseh, on the west side of the Jordan. We are told that "there came an angel of the Lord, and sat under an oak which was at Ophrah, that pertained unto Joash the Abiezrite; and his son Gideon threshed wheat by the wine-press, *to hide it from the Midianites.*" This intimation most expressively illustrates the state to which the Hebrews were reduced by the nomade Arabs. They could not retain any part of their produce except by stealth, and Gideon was obliged to thresh his wheat in an unusual place to conceal it from the rapacious invaders. The smallness of the quantity is shown by the manner in which it was threshed—not with cattle, as was usual with large quantities, but by means of the flail. The threshing, moreover, was near the wine-press, and consequently on ground appropriated to another purpose; it was also in the open air, otherwise Gideon could not have expected dew to fall on the ground, or on the fleeces he spread out there, Judges vi. 37-40.

The angel saluted Gideon—"The Lord

is with thee, thou mighty man of valour." Gideon replied—"O my lord, if the Lord be with us, why then is all this evil befallen us? and where be all his miracles which our fathers told us of, saying, Did not the Lord bring us up from Egypt? but now the Lord hath forsaken us, and delivered us into the hands of the Midianites." It does not appear that Gideon was aware that the person whom he was addressing was a heavenly messenger, and the subsequent incidents of the interview favour this assumption. He was told—"Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites; have I not told thee?" Gideon replied—"O my lord, wherewith shall I save Israel? behold, my family is poor in Manasseh, and I am the least in my father's house." The angel repeated the declaration that he would "smite the Midianites as one man," to which Gideon rejoined—"If now I have found grace in thy sight, then show me a sign that thou talkest with me. Depart not hence, I pray thee, until I come unto thee, and bring forth my present, and set it before thee." A ready assent was given to this proposal, and "Gideon went in, and made ready a kid, and unleavened cakes of an ephah of flour, the flesh he put in a basket, and he put the broth in a pot, and brought it out to him under the oak, and presented it." This indicates that he either boiled or stewed the kid, and served up the meat and soup separately; or that he stewed one part of it, and roasted or boiled the other—both common ways of preparing a repast in Oriental countries. When meat is thus dressed in two ways, the stew is generally intended for immediate use, and the other for the traveller to carry with him for refreshment on the way. This was evidently intended by Gideon, when he put the flesh in a basket, to be taken away by his visitor for future use.

The angel said to him—"Take the flesh, and the unleavened cakes, and lay them on this rock, and pour out the broth." As soon as he had so done, the

angel touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes with his staff, and instantly a "fire rose up out of the rock," and consumed them, at which the mysterious visitor disappeared. Gideon at once perceived that he had conversed with an angel and expressed his alarm, but Jehovah said to him—"Peace be unto thee; fear not: thou shalt not die." He then built an altar, and called it *Jehovah-shalom*, which means, *the Lord send peace*.

By Divine announcement Gideon was ordered to throw down his father's altar to Baal, and to cut down the grove near it, and on that same night to build an altar to God on the top of the rock, and to offer a burnt-sacrifice with the wood of the grove. In this service he was assisted by ten of his servants, and he performed it with the utmost dispatch, "because he feared his father's household, and the men of the city, that he could not do it by day." On the morning when the inhabitants saw the altar of Baal overthrown, and the grove cut down, they were astonished and enraged at the daring act. They inquired who had done it, and the answer was, "Gideon the son of Joash hath done this thing." They repaired to the house of Joash, and demanded him to deliver his son into their hands that "he may die, because he hath cast down the altar of Baal, and because he hath cut down the grove that was by it." But Joash replied—"Will ye plead for Baal? will ye save him? he that will plead for him let him be put to death while it is yet morning; if he be a god let him plead for himself, because one hath cast down his altar." On this occasion he gave his son the surname of *Jerubbaal*, which means, *he that disputes about Baal*, or *that revenges the idol*, for he said, "Let Baal plead against him, because he hath thrown down his altar."

The Midianites, Amalekites, and their nomade allies, convened in the Valley of Jezreel evidently intent on some new outrage. But the "Spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon, and he blew a trum-

pet," which made his own domestics and relatives rally round him. The attitude of defiance was now assumed, and the wild invaders were to find their adventurous career disputed. Messengers were sent throughout Gideon's own tribe of Manasseh, and also throughout Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali, and many joined the standard of deliverance. Gideon, who was well aware of the responsibility he was about to incur, resolved to appeal to Jehovah for signs of success before he openly charged the Midianites. "If," he addressed Jehovah, "thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast said, behold, I will put a fleece of wool in the floor, and if the dew be on the fleece only, and it be dry on all the earth beside, then shall I know that thou wilt save Israel by mine hand, as thou hast said." The sign he requested was given to him—"for he rose up early on the morrow, and thrust the fleece together, and wringed the dew out of the fleece, a bowl full of water." Once more he besought another sign, which was exactly reversing the former one, by proposing the ground to be covered with dew, while the fleece was dry, and "God did so that night, for it was dry upon the fleece only, and there was dew on all the ground." Respecting this miracle it has been appropriately observed, that the dew on the fleece was a kind of public testimony to satisfy the officers and people under Gideon, and we consequently see the reason of its repetition with the opposite variation; for, if there were any of his adherents who suspected deception in the first instance, when the threshing-floor was dry, and the fleece wet with dew, they might be convinced by the contrary effect, when the fleece was dry, and the threshing-floor wet.

Thus satisfied of the Divine intentions Gideon soon found himself at the head of thirty-two thousand men, prepared to give battle to the Midianites. He encamped by the Well of Harod, and the enemy were on the north side of the Israelites by the hill of Moreh. While thus prepared a divine communication

was made to Gideon—"The people that are with thee are too many for me to give the Midianites into their hands, lest Israel vaunt themselves against me, saying, Mine own hand hath saved me. Now therefore go to, proclaim in the ears of the people, saying, Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart early from Mount Gilead." This Mount Gilead is not the mountain of that name east of the Jordan, so often mentioned in Scripture, but another west of the Jordan in the tribe of Manasseh, in which cantonment the opposing armies were encamped. God knew the disposition of the Israelites, and foresaw that from motives of vanity they would be disposed to ascribe the victory to their own prowess, whereas he intended to show to the world that it was His miraculous work. It appears that twenty-two thousand took advantage of the proclamation and left the camp, reducing Gideon's army to ten thousand men. But Jehovah said to Gideon—"The people are yet too many; bring them down unto the water, and I will try them for thee there; and it shall be that of whom I say unto thee, This shall go with thee, the same shall go with thee; and of whomsoever I say unto thee, This shall not go with thee, the same shall not go with thee." Gideon acted according to the Divine instructions—he brought his army to the water, where he was told—"Every one that lappeth of the water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself; likewise every one that boweth down upon his knees to drink." Three hundred of them "lapped, putting their hand to their mouth," and Jehovah said—"By the three hundred men that lapped will I save you, and deliver the Midianites into thine hand; and let all the other people go, every man into his place." With this small band, Gideon was to oppose the Midianites, and he dismissed all the rest.

The two modes of action here mentioned—"lapping, putting their hand to their mouth," and "bowing down upon their knees to drink," have been variously

interpreted, especially the former. We may infer that the men were made thirsty by the heat of the weather and the march, which would make water peculiarly desirable to them, and symptoms of courage or cowardice have been conjectured from these different ways of drinking amongst the soldiers—some supposing that the act of snatching it with the hand denoted a fearful temper, and others that this way of drinking denoted courage, or a temperate and hardy disposition. It is well known that the dog drinks, or *laps*, by shaping the end of its long thin tongue into the form of a spoon, which it rapidly introduces and withdraws from the water, throwing each time a quantity of the fluid into its mouth; but the tongue of man is not adapted to this use, and it is therefore physically impossible for him to lap as a dog does. An ingenious explanation has been given—that the men, instead of kneeling down to take a long draught from the water, employed the hand as the dog employs its tongue, by forming the hand into a hollow spoon, and dipping it into the stream. This is often done in the East, and is well known among fatigued and thirsty travellers in the heat of summer in our own country. Too much time would be consumed in lying down to take a draught or successive draughts, and the distinction is accordingly apparent, for those who "lapped" in this manner, "putting their hand to their mouth," were considered to evince a readiness for action which peculiarly fitted them for the service on which Gideon was engaged. Stackhouse observes—"God was minded to reduce the army of Gideon to a very small number, which it was probable would be effected by this means, for as the season was hot, and the generality of the soldiers weary, thirsty, and faint, it was most probable that they would lie down, as indeed they did, and refresh themselves plentifully, and it was scarcely to be expected that any great number would deny themselves in this matter."

It was divinely announced to Gideon that night—"Arise, get thee down unto the host, for I have delivered it into

thine hand. But if thou fear to go down, go thou with Phurah thy servant down to the host, and thou shalt hear what they say, and afterward shall thine hand be strengthened to go down unto the host." This is a very remarkable intimation, and requires to be explained. It was in reality an instruction to Gideon to undertake the office of a spy; and it must be remembered that the ideas of the Hebrews, like those of the ancient Greeks, concerning the character of a spy, were widely different from those which prevail in Europe. Among them the office was usually assumed either by the principal commander, or by persons of high rank and influence. Gideon, accompanied by Phurah, advanced to the outside of the enemy's encampment, and he found that the "Midianites and the Amalekites, and all the children of the east, lay along in the valley like grasshoppers for multitude; and their camels were without number, as the sand by the sea side for multitude."

When Gideon returned from this duty, a very remarkable dream of one of his followers was narrated to him. The man had first told it to a companion, and the substance of it was, that "a cake of barley bread tumbled into the host of Midian and came unto a tent, and smote it that it fell, and overturned it, that the tent lay along." His companion answered—"This is nothing else save the sword of Gideon, the son of Joash, a man of Israel; for into his hand hath God delivered Midian and all the host." It must be remembered that Gideon's little force was on the hill of Moreh, and the Midianites were encamped in the valley below; and as the man in his dream saw the barley-cake roll down the hill into the valley, overturning the tent with which it came in contact, it was naturally connected with Gideon. The insignificance of the cause which produced this result—not a *large stone*, but a *barley-cake*—has a peculiar reference to Gideon's handful of warriors who were to route the mighty nomade host arranged against them. Gideon heard the inter-

pretation with the greatest satisfaction, and assured his followers that God would give them the victory.

The three hundred men were divided into three companies, each man with a trumpet, an empty pitcher, and lamps (*firebrands* or *torches*) within the pitchers, and Gideon gave them their instructions. "Look on me," he said, "and do likewise, and, behold, when I come to the outside of the camp it shall be that, as I do, so ye shall do. When I blow with a trumpet, I and all that are with me, then blow ye the trumpets also on every side of all the camp, and say, The sword of the Lord and of Gideon." The three companies, though acting in concert, were stationed on different sides of the nomade encampment, and at the appointed signal, they made the attack during the night:—"The three companies blew the trumpets, and brake the pitchers, and held the lamps in their left hands, and the trumpets in their right hands to blow withal, and they cried, The sword of the Lord and of Gideon." This celebrated war-cry was taken from the interpretation of the dream of the barley cake. It was simply at first, *The sword of Gideon*, but the hero piously prefixed the name of the Lord, thus acknowledging himself the mere agent in this great deliverance of his countrymen.

This extraordinary mode of attack completely paralyzed the Midianites, and when they recovered from their surprise, they commenced a general flight, pursued by the Hebrews, who previous to the route had done no more than merely sound the trumpets. This is one of the most remarkable stratagems on record in the history of military operations, setting aside for a moment the great fact that it was superintended and carried into effect by Divine Providence. The position of the Hebrews was singular—standing about the camp blowing their trumpets and holding their torches, as if to give light to the fighting men whom the Midianites believed had entered their camp, while they gave just sufficient light to enable their enemies to

slay each other, without distinguishing friends from enemies. The Midianites very naturally supposed, from the number of Gideon's trumpeters, that his army must be immense in proportion, and the confusion in the encampment of the undisciplined hordes would be increased by the alarm and fright of their cattle. Two Midianite chiefs, Oreb and Zeeb, were taken prisoners, and their heads were afterwards cut off—a very ancient and still a modern mode of treating captives of distinction or importance in some nations. In most parts of Asia it has been the custom from time immemorial either to decapitate the captured chief on the spot and send his head to the king, or to send him to the capital to be there treated in the same manner.

In the course of this complete discomfiture Zibah and Zalmunna, two Midianitish kings or emirs, were taken during the flight, and likewise put to death by the hand of Gideon himself, to revenge the slaughter of his relatives. Of the numerous army of the rapacious nomades, one hundred and twenty thousand were left dead on the field, and only fifteen thousand saved themselves by flight. Gideon succeeded in pacifying the Ephraimites, who complained bitterly of being neglected in the summons to take the field against the Midianites; and the towns of Succoth and Penuel, the inhabitants of which had refused to relieve his army, he ordered to be destroyed. This splendid achievement of Gideon directed the attention of his countrymen towards him, and in the warmth of their gratitude they offered him hereditary royalty, which he magnanimously rejected. He replied, in the true spirit of the Jewish theocracy, "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you." The Shechemites, indeed, after his death elevated one of his sons, named Abimelech, and the most abandoned of the whole family, to the regal dignity. They also built an idolatrous temple; but they suffered merited punishment from their

own king, and their temple was destroyed by fire.

Among the spoils taken from the Midianites was an immense quantity of golden ear-rings, collars, or, more properly, ear-pendants called drops, and ornaments on their camels' necks. Gideon induced the Hebrews to make a voluntary surrender of these valuables to him, of which he made an ephod, and placed it in his own city of Ophrah. Some think that this ephod was merely a trophy commemorating the deliverance of the Israelites, while others conjecture with greater probability that he founded a sacerdotal establishment there, where sacrifices might be regularly performed. If the former supposition is correct, the worship would doubtless be in honour of the true God, though it was improper and unauthorised; and, if the latter, it soon degenerated into superstition and idolatry, and the "thing became a snare unto Gideon and to his house;" for even in his lifetime it withdrew the attention of the people east of the Jordan from the tabernacle at Shiloh, and tended to precipitate the Hebrews into that idolatry to which they addicted themselves after his death.

Gideon died "in a good old age," and was buried at Ophrah in the sepulchre of his ancestors. We are told that he had "many wives," and that his offspring by them consisted of seventy sons, exclusive of Abimelech, whose mother was a concubine resident in Shechem. After his death the Israelites made one of their usual relapses into idolatry, for which they were again severely punished. It is intimated that they also conducted themselves ungratefully towards Gideon's family. "Neither," says the inspired historian, "showed they kindness to the house of Jerubbaal, namely, Gideon, according to all the goodness which he had showed unto Israel."

GOLIATH. See DAVID. Also, the name of another giant killed by Elhanan of Bethlehem, 2 Sam. xxi. 19, called Lahmi, 1 Chron. xx. 5.

H

HABAKKUK, one of the Minor Prophets, is supposed to have been a native of Bethzakar, and of the tribe of Simeon. Few authentic particulars are known of this Prophet, whom the Greek translators call *Abbakoum*. Some relate that, foreseeing the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, he escaped to Arabia, and that he returned to Judea after the city was taken by the Chaldeans and employed himself in agriculture. He died and was buried in his own country two years before the end of the Captivity. Jerome asserts that he was contemporary with Daniel, and that he is the same to whom the Apocryphal history of Bel and the Dragon is ascribed. The precise time is not known when Habakkuk prophesied, but from his predicting the ruin of the Jews by the Chaldeans, the conquests, metaphosis, and death of Nebuchadnezzar, and the judgments which would befall the Chaldeans, it may be concluded that he was contemporary with Jeremiah. The style of Habakkuk is poetical, and his ode in the third chapter may be classed among the perfect specimens of beauty and grandeur of expression.

HADAD. See **DAVID**.

HADADEZER, or **HADAREZER**. See **DAVID**.

HADASSAH. See **ESTHER**.

HAGAR. See **ABRAHAM** and **ISHMAEL**.

HAGGAI, reckoned as the tenth in order among the Prophets, may be considered the first of the three Prophets who flourished among the Jews after their return to their country from the Captivity. He is generally supposed to have been born at Babylon, whence he returned with Zerubbabel, and he appears to have been commissioned by God to urge forward the work of the Temple, which had been interrupted nearly fourteen years, in consequence of the in-

trigues of the Samaritans, and other obstructions to the edict of Cyrus. Epiphanius relates that he died at Jerusalem, and was buried among the priests. It is observed by Bishop Lowth that the style of this Prophet is altogether prosaic, but Archbishop Newcome has given a translation on the supposition that a great part of it admits of a metrical division.

HAM, the youngest son of Noah, was the father of Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan. See **CANAAN** and **NOAH**.

HAMAN. See **ESTHER**.

HANNAH. See **SAMUEL**.

HANUN. See **DAVID**.

HAZAEI, king of Syria, and a grievous oppressor of the Hebrews, succeeded Benhadad, whom he murdered, as the Prophet Elisha intimated. See **ELISHA**.

HERMAS, and **HERMES**, were Roman Christians saluted by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 14. Hermas is supposed to be the author of an ancient book called the *Shepherd* or *Pastor*, which is quoted by Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, and others, and held in great estimation by the Fathers. It was written in Greek about A.D. 92, a little before Domitian's persecution, and contains many allusions to the genuine Books of the New Testament, though none are expressly cited, while there are no allusions to any of the Apocryphal Gospels or other spurious writings. It contains four visions, twelve commands, and ten similitudes. The best translation is that of Archbishop Wake, in his "Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers."

HERMOGENES, a heretical teacher of Christianity, mentioned by St Paul, with Phygellus, of whom nothing is known. From the manner in which both are noticed, it may be inferred that they had opposed the Apostle's doctrines with great virulence, and had spoken calumniously of him.

HEROD, called **THE GREAT**, king of

the Jews, the second son of Antipater, an Idumean of a noble family, was born B.C. 69 or 71, and is celebrated as the reigning sovereign of Judea when our Saviour was born. He is first introduced to our notice in the Gospel by causing an inhuman massacre of all the male children of Bethlehem below a certain age, in the hope that our blessed Saviour would be included—an action in accordance with his disposition. At the age of twenty-five Herod was made governor of Galilee, by his father, and in this situation he soon gave proofs of his enterprising spirit. He attacked a band of robbers in that province headed by one Hezekiah, and put all to death who fell in his way, including their turbulent leader. This gained for him the respect of the people, and of Sextus Cæsar, Prefect of Syria, but as he had acted on his own responsibility, and had executed the culprits without the form of a trial, the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem summoned him to appear before them, for having exercised in an arbitrary manner the power of life and death. He obeyed the citation, but at the suggestion of his father he presented himself before the judges arrayed in a purple robe, and attended by his life-guard. The members of the Sanhedrim were confounded at this boldness, and were so much awed that they were inclined to desist from farther proceedings, when Sameas, supposed to be Simeon, mentioned by St Luke (ii. 25–35), reproved them for their timidity, and assured them that the time would come when Herod would refuse to pardon them, though they had pardoned him—a prediction afterwards literally verified. The remonstrances of Sameas made the Sanhedrim ashamed of their conduct, but Hyrcanus, the president, to whose protection Herod had been recommended by a letter from Sextus Cæsar, declared the session concluded, and gave Herod a hint to leave Jerusalem. He departed to Damascus, where he found Sextus Cæsar, who received him with open arms, and gave him the government of all Cælo-Syria, on the condition of paying a certain tribute. Not satisfied

with having braved and set at defiance the supreme tribunal, Herod collected a small army, and actually marched towards Jerusalem to punish the Sanhedrim and depose Hyrcanus, but he was persuaded to relinquish his imprudent design by his father and his elder brother Phasaël.

After the assassination of Julius Cæsar, the Roman Empire was rent by most serious dissensions. During these civil strifes, carried on by Caius Octavius, the nephew and adopted son of Julius Cæsar, afterwards the Emperor Augustus, Mark Antony, and Lepidus, men who were mortal enemies to each other, Cassius Longinus, one of the murderers of Cæsar, who had been compelled with others to leave Italy on account of the predominant influence of Octavius and Antony, maintained himself in Asia against the proconsul Dolabella, and united with Murcus and Martius Crispus, who were besieging Bassus at Apamea. In the war which followed a heavy tribute was demanded to support an immense army and large fleet, and Palestine alone was required to pay seven hundred talents. Herod paid the share imposed on his district before any of the others, which procured for him the esteem of Longinus. About this time his father Antipater was poisoned by Malichus, a governor in whose behalf he had interceded respecting his proportion of the tribute, and Herod revenged this atrocity by representing it to Longinus, and causing Malichus to be put to death at Tyre by the Roman soldiers. After the departure of Longinus from Palestine the adherents of Malichus excited great disturbances at Jerusalem, by their attempts to retaliate the death of their leader on Herod and Phasaël. They succeeded in bringing Hyrcanus over to their party, and also the commander of the Roman troops left in Palestine by Longinus. Herod at this time lay sick at Damascus, but his brother Phasaël expelled the insurgents from Jerusalem, and when he arrived in person the whole party was suppressed. Herod and Phasaël made heavy complaints against

Hyrcanus for his conduct in this affair, but a reconciliation was soon effected, because Herod designed to marry his daughter Mariamne.

But the party of Malichus speedily revived, and called Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus II., king of the Jews, to occupy his father's throne. This project was favoured by Marion, king of Tyre, who hated Herod—by Meneus, prince of Chalcis, who had married the sister of Antigonus—and by Fabius, the Roman prefect of Damascus, who had received a liberal present to support it. Antigonus marched into Judea with an army, but he was completely defeated by Herod, and compelled for a while to relinquish his purpose. The discontented party was not discouraged by this ill fortune. In the year B.C. 41, they sent an embassy to Antony, who had then arrived in Syria, complaining that Herod and Phasaël were undermining the authority of Hyrcanus. Herod, however, had gained the favour of Antony, who paid no attention to the allegations of his enemies. Nearly one hundred of the principal Jews then set out to Antony, who was then at Daphne near Antioch, to renew their accusations. The victorious Roman asked Hyrcanus in their presence whom he esteemed most capable of administering the government under him, and he named Herod and Phasaël, who were instantly appointed tetrarchs of Palestine. Notwithstanding this promotion, another deputation, consisting of a thousand Jews, proceeded to Antony at Tyre, to renew the same complaints, but the Roman general viewed such a numerous assemblage as little short of rebellion, and sent his soldiers among them, who killed and wounded a considerable number.

In the year B.C. 37, after the Parthians made themselves masters of Syria, Antigonus by their assistance renewed his attempt for the throne of Judea. He marched to Jerusalem, but he was there repulsed by Herod and Phasaël, and obliged to take refuge in the Temple. Herod garrisoned the royal castle of Baris, which stood in

the vicinity, and the two parties exerted all their energies to annoy each other. The strength of both was increased by those Jews who came from the country to celebrate the feast of Pentecost, and, after various obstinate and bloody conflicts, Herod was compelled to depart hastily from Jerusalem during the night with his soldiers, and betake himself to the strong fortress of Masada, which he had built on a mountain west of the Dead Sea. The pursuit of his enemies obliged him to maintain a constant conflict throughout his retreat, though he was successful in repelling their attacks. Once during his flight he resolved to commit suicide, but was dissuaded from his purpose by his friends. Having placed his family and his treasures in the castle of Masada under the protection of eight hundred men, he dismissed about nine thousand of his followers. He then retired with a small body of troops to Petra, to seek the assistance of Malchus, the successor of King Aretas, but the Arabian refused to receive him, and he was compelled to disband his soldiers. He proceeded to Alexandria, where with a small retinue he embarked, and sailed for Rome. After the escape of Herod, his rival Antigonus was raised to the throne, and the Parthians, who plundered Jerusalem and all the places adjacent, delivered to him Phasaël and the high priest Hyrcanus, whom they had made prisoners. Phasaël committed suicide by dashing his head against the walls of his dungeon, to avert being put to death by his enemies; and Hyrcanus had his ears cut off, which rendered him incapable of holding the office of high priest, in which mutilated state he was sent by Antigonus to the Parthians, who carried him to the city of Seleucia on the Tigris.

Meanwhile Herod arrived at Rome, where he renewed his friendship with Antony, to whom he promised a large sum of money to forward his projects, and by him he was presented to Octavius as the son of that Antipater who had rendered important services to his uncle Julius Cæsar in Egypt. He requested

that Aristobulus, the son of Hyrcanus, and brother of his espoused wife Mariamne, might be appointed king of Judea, and that he might be made governor under him; but Octavius elevated Herod himself to the throne, and he was inaugurated with idolatrous sacrifices in the Capitol, B.C. 37. All this was done so expeditiously that in seven days Herod departed from Rome, and landed at Ptolemais in little more than three months after his precipitate flight from Jerusalem.

When Herod arrived again in Palestine the Parthians had retired from Syria, and the Romans had resumed the possession of the country. He began to collect an army, and after receiving some auxiliaries from the Roman generals he took possession of all Galilee, with the exception of a few inconsiderable places, and conquered Joppa. He then hastened to relieve his family in the fortress of Masada, which was closely invested by Antigonus. He raised the siege of this place, delivered his family from danger, and took possession of Ressa, a strong fortress in Idumea, whence he returned and formed a junction with the Roman general Silo, whom Ventidius, the commander of the Roman forces in the East, had sent to his aid. He encamped before Jerusalem, but he found that both Ventidius and Silo had no sincere intention of assisting him in his plans. The latter, in particular, had received large sums from each of the leaders, and drawing off his troops to winter quarters in Samaria, Galilee, and Idumea, after pillaging the country under the pretence of want of provisions, Herod was in consequence obliged to retire from Jerusalem. But he still kept his soldiers in action. He sent one division of his army under the command of his brother Joseph to secure Idumea, while with the other he marched into Galilee, conquered various fortified places, and cleared the country of robbers, who were so numerous in some places as to be able to form a regular army, and engage in pitched battles, sometimes nearly defeating Herod. He

finally succeeded in driving them over the Jordan, though some still remained concealed in caves, and then distributed his soldiers into winter quarters.

In the spring of the following year, B.C. 36, Herod renewed his exertions to subdue the banditti who still lurked in the caves. Josephus tells us that he was obliged to let his soldiers down in chests by ropes over the rocky steepes of the mountains of Arbela, and when they had thus reached the entrance of the caves, they had severe conflicts with the concealed robbers. Herod was at length compelled to adopt severe measures with these outlaws. He every where put them to death, destroyed the caves in which they lurked, and banished all who had assisted them, by which means he restored quiet to Galilee.

Having expelled the robbers, Herod marched to Jerusalem against Antigonus, but he was again obliged to retire to Galilee on hearing that they had recommenced their depredations, and had defeated the troops he had left there. Peace being once more restored in that quarter, Herod received from Ventidius by the orders of Antony two legions of foot soldiers and one thousand cavalry, under the command of Macherus, but these auxiliaries did him more harm than afford him any assistance, for Macherus, who had been violently repelled by the slingers from the walls of Jerusalem in an attempt to hold a conference with Antigonus, was so enraged that he put all the Jews he met, not excepting some of Herod's soldiers, to the sword. Herod was greatly irritated at this act of cruelty, and instantly departed to Samosata, where Antony was encamped. Macherus, who justly feared the resentment of his superior, overtook Herod on the way, and succeeded in pacifying him; but he continued his journey to pay his respects to Antony, and procure more efficient aid. During his absence his brother Joseph was defeated with great slaughter by Antigonus when marching towards Jericho. Herod was informed of this disaster when he was at Daphne on his return

to Palestine. He quickened his pace, having obtained the assistance of two Roman legions, and raised eight hundred soldiers on Mount Libanus. He marched into Galilee, and again settled the affairs of that turbulent province, after which he proceeded to Samaria. He suffered a repulse on the way from Antigonus, but he soon afterwards defeated Papus, his rival's general. The severity of the winter compelled the contending parties to betake themselves to quarters.

In the following spring Herod, who had made the best preparations for the campaign, besieged Jerusalem, during which time he married Mariamne, expecting that this connection with the family of the Maccabees, most popular in Judea, would favour his cause. At his return to the camp, the Roman general Sosius joined him with his troops, and his army was now increased to eleven legions, besides the Syrian auxiliaries, and a body of six thousand cavalry. Nevertheless, the city of Jerusalem was not reduced till the next year, when it was taken by assault, and the Romans, enraged at the obstinate defence of the citizens, plundered and massacred indiscriminately without resistance. Herod was obliged to advance a large sum of money to prevent the total destruction of his capital. Antigonus surrendered himself in the most cowardly manner, and was treated with the greatest indignity. Sosius contemptuously repelled him from his presence, scornfully designating him *Antigona*, as if he was unworthy the name of a man. He was carried in chains to Antioch, where Antony, who was assured by Herod that there would never be peace in Judea as long as he lived, condemned him to death, and this unfortunate descendant of the Maccabees, or Asmonean family, was executed by the axe of the lictor like a common malefactor. Having thus fought his way to the throne, Herod obtained full possession of the kingdom, which the Romans had bestowed upon him three years before.

The first care of Herod was to re-

plenish his coffers, and to repress the party still attached to the Asmonean race, who regarded him as an usurper. He made himself odious by his cruelties, every day murdering some of those who had opposed him, and all the members of the Sanhedrim were put to death except two, who during the siege had continually urged their countrymen to receive him as king. He appointed a common priest named Ananel of Babylon, though descended from the ancient high priests, to that office, that the Jews might find no support from a high priest of their own party. He persuaded Hyrcanus, who was maintained in princely state at Seleucia by the Eastern Jews, to return to Jerusalem, under pretence of recompensing him for former favours; and the aged exile was weak enough, notwithstanding the remonstrances of his supporters, to believe the insidious professions of Herod, who treated him indeed for some time with great respect.

During the year B.C. 32, Herod was reluctantly compelled by the earnest entreaties of his queen Mariamne, of whom he was doatingly fond, to depose Ananel from the high priesthood, and bestow the office on Aristobulus, her brother, then a youth only seventeen years old. To this arrangement he was farther obliged to submit by the representations which Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus II. and mother of Mariamne, made to the celebrated Cleopatra, and through her to Antony. Herod was so greatly enraged at Alexandra for interfering in this business, that he ordered her to be confined in her own palace, and made some of his confidential servants watch her movements. She complained of the manner in which she was treated in several letters to Cleopatra, who advised her to attempt an escape, and invited her to Egypt. The stratagem she adopted was not a little extraordinary. She procured two coffins, in one of which she placed herself, and in the other her son Aristobulus, and in this condition they were both to be carried by night to the sea coast, where a ship was ready to

receive them. Herod, however, became acquainted with the design, and frustrated it, but the fear of Cleopatra prevented him from treating the intended fugitives with severity. He pretended to overlook the whole contrivance, secretly resolving to put Aristobulus out of the way lest he might become dangerous to him in future. His dread of this descendant of the Asmonean family was increased by observing the dispositions of the people. At the next feast of tabernacles, while the youthful high priest was performing the functions of his office, the Jews manifested their affection for him in the most enthusiastic manner. Shortly afterwards Herod visited Alexandra at Jericho, when he proposed to Aristobulus among other amusements that they should bathe in a lake. The young high priest assented, and while in the water Herod's servants, as if in sport, kept him immersed until he was drowned. Herod affected great concern for his untimely death, and ordered magnificent funeral solemnities, but his conduct was viewed as a piece of hypocrisy to conceal the delight he felt at the success of his stratagem.

Alexandra duly informed Cleopatra of Herod's perfidy, and the queen of Egypt pledged herself to use every exertion to procure his punishment. She preferred an accusation against him to Antony while he was at Laodicea, B.C. 31, where he was summoned to answer the charges, but by liberal bribes he effected a reconciliation, and Cleopatra, who wanted to gain possession of Judea, was satisfied for the present with the gift of Cœlo-Syria. On this occasion Herod gave a most remarkable display of the conflict of opposite passions in a ferocious heart, which caused new troubles in his family. Knowing the influence of Cleopatra with Antony, it is said that when he set out for Laodicea he entertained little hope of escaping with his life. He committed the affairs of the kingdom and the care of his family to his uncle Joseph, from whom he exacted a solemn promise, that if Antony condemned him his beloved wife Mariamne was to be put to death, to prevent

her falling into the hands of the voluptuous Roman. Joseph watched over her with the greatest solicitude, and during Herod's absence informed her of this affair as a proof of her husband's affection. Abhorring such a savage demonstration of love, Mariamne from that moment entertained the deepest aversion to Herod, which was sedulously inflamed by her mother Alexandra. A report was almost immediately circulated that Herod had been put to death, and Alexandra was anxious to obtain the protection of the Roman legion—then encamped before Jerusalem, but the rumour was soon contradicted by letters from Herod himself, in which he stated that Antony had received him in a friendly manner. When he returned to Jerusalem his jealousy was roused by his sister Salome, who informed him of Joseph's frequent visits to Mariamne. He communicated his suspicions to his wife, and was convinced from the conversation that the charge was a mere calumny, but hearing from her own lips afterwards that Joseph had informed her of his secret commission to put her to death, his jealousy was revived, and his rage was unbounded. In the first transports of passion he ran upon her with his drawn sword, and it was only his excessive love for her which prevented him from killing her on the spot. He ordered Joseph to be executed and Alexandra to be imprisoned, while he attempted to effect a reconciliation with Mariamne.

During this year Antony, who could now deny Cleopatra nothing, gave her the district of Jericho, then the most fertile part of Judea, with its orchards of balsam trees, and the cities on the sea coast, with the exception of Tyre and Sidon, and that part of Arabia which bordered on Egypt. Herod was compelled to negotiate with the rapacious queen for this valuable part of his dominions, and engaged to pay her a yearly tribute of two hundred talents. "Although," says the commentator on Josephus, who gives a minute account of these transactions, "Cleopatra had more than once exerted all her influence with Antony to bring Herod

to the scaffold, yet on her return from the Euphrates, to which place she attended her lover on his way to Armenia, she visited this hated king at Jerusalem, and had the presumption to attempt to entangle him in her snares. But her fascinations were exerted to no purpose, and even her life would have fallen a sacrifice to her temerity, if Herod had not dreaded the vengeance of Antony. From motives of prudence the king concealed his disgust, and entertained his treacherous and unwelcome guest in the most hospitable manner. He even attended her to the frontiers of Egypt with every demonstration of honour, and by such means endeavoured to mollify her malicious and vindictive spirit towards him. He determined, however, to have a place of refuge in case of need, for which purpose he strengthened the fortress of Masada, and furnished it with arms for ten thousand men."

In the war between Antony and Octavius Cæsar, Herod raised an army to assist the former, and received orders, when about to proceed to Athens with his forces, to march against Malchus, the Arabian emir of Petra, who had refused to pay the tribute for that part of his dominions bordering on Egypt which had been given to Cleopatra. Herod obeyed the injunction, and was victorious in his first encounter with Malchus, but he was soon afterwards defeated with great loss in Cælo-Syria. A violent earthquake succeeded this disaster in Judea, which was so fatal that, according to the testimony of Josephus in his Antiquities, ten thousand, or, as he says in his History of the Jewish War, thirty thousand persons perished. Herod attempted to make peace with Malchus, but the victorious emir would listen to no terms, put the Jewish ambassadors to death, and marched his army into Judea. As Herod's army had escaped the calamity of the earthquake, he was well prepared to receive the Arab prince, who in his first battle lost five thousand men, and being then besieged in his camp he was forced for want of water to a second battle, in

which seven thousand more of his soldiers were slain. Herod now dictated peace on his own terms.

Herod up to this time had been faithful to Antony, but when he found that the latter had rejected his advice to put Cleopatra to death, and to levy a new army in Egypt with her treasures, he determined to make peace if possible with Octavius, the great rival of Antony, and the future master of the Roman world. He resolved to visit him in person, and he committed the government of his kingdom to his brother Pheroras, with directions to ascend the throne if he did not return. About this time the venerable Hyrcanus, then eighty years of age, whom he had persuaded to leave Seleucia, attempted, at the instigation of his daughter Alexandra, to escape from Jerusalem to Arabia, and Herod availed himself of that circumstance to put to death this last surviving male descendant of the Asmoneans, who had strong claims to the crown. He placed Mariamne and her mother in the castle of Alexandrium, with orders to the commanders, who were devoted to his interest, to murder both whenever they received certain notice that he was slain. He then set out to meet Octavius, whom he found at Rhodes after his return from Italy, B.C. 27. He appeared before the master of the Roman Empire arrayed in his royal ornaments except his diadem, and frankly acknowledged all that he had done for his benefactor Antony, at the same time declaring that he would have still continued faithful to him, notwithstanding his misfortunes, if his services had been well received, and professing his readiness to transfer the same gratitude to a new patron from whom he would hold his crown and kingdom. Octavius, or, to adopt his imperial name, Augustus, was struck with the magnanimity of Herod's defence, and replaced the diadem on his head; and he continued from that time the most favoured of the tributary sovereigns. Herod returned to Judea elated at his success, and found all his affairs in a most favourable state, except that

Mariamne, who had again detected the cruel order for her conditional destruction, was in great trouble, and her affections completely alienated from him. His mother and sister embraced this opportunity to inflame his suspicions against her, in which, it will be subsequently seen, they were completely successful.

Augustus, in the prosecution of the war against Antony and Cleopatra, proceeded in person through Asia Minor and Syria to invade Egypt on the east. When he arrived in Judea, Herod endeavoured to show himself an active and useful friend. He entertained the illustrious Roman and his whole army at Ptolemais with great magnificence, presented him with eight hundred talents, and supplied him with water and provisions during his whole march as far as Pelusium. The death of Antony and Cleopatra finished the Egyptian campaign; that country was made a Roman province, and Augustus was without a rival. When Herod was informed of the result he went to meet Augustus, who left Egypt in September, and he accompanied the Roman conqueror through Arabia, Palestine, and Syria, as far as Antioch, and received from him not only the district of Jericho, but also Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Joppa, and other places, which considerably augmented his revenues and dominions.

But all these favours were embittered by domestic broils, and especially by the insuperable aversion of Mariamne. She repelled with disdain Herod's endeavours to please her, and reproached him with the murder of her brother, her father, her uncle, and her grandfather. She often upbraided his mother and sister with the meanness of their birth, and they in revenge made every exertion to procure her destruction. Salome persuaded one of her domestics to prefer an accusation against her to Herod, that she had once attempted to induce him to give the king a philter which was supposed to contain poison. Her most faithful eunuch was put to the torture, but the only information he could give was, that

the hatred of the queen must have arisen from something which Sohen, the governor of the castle of Alexandria, had said to her while Herod was absent at Rhodes. He inferred from this that Sohen had not only betrayed his secret instructions, but that a criminal intercourse had taken place, and the alleged delinquent was immediately executed. He next accused Mariamne of adultery, and she was tried, convicted, and condemned by judges of his own selection, who decided according to his wishes. They supposed the sentence of death would not be inflicted, and Herod indeed wished to keep Mariamne in prison for a time, but the representations of his mother and sister prevailed, and she was ordered to be executed. On her way to execution she was assailed by her mother Alexandra, who began to entertain suspicions of her own safety, and who, to make her peace with the tyrant, had accused her own daughter. Mariamne merely expressed emotions of pity that a mother could so conduct herself. She submitted to her fate with all the intrepidity of innocence, and was sufficiently avenged by the remorse of Herod, who seems never afterwards to have enjoyed a tranquil hour. "She died," says Prideaux, "as she lived—great, firm, and fearless to the last. Thus ended the life of this virtuous and excellent princess. In the beauty and other charms and graces of her person she excelled all the women of her time, and would have been a lady without exception, could she have carried it with some better temper and complaisance towards her husband; but considering that he had built his fortune upon the ruins of her family—that he had usurped from them the crown which he wore—that he had caused her father, her grandfather, her brother, and her uncle, to be put to death for the serving of his designs, and had twice ordered her death in case of his own, it would put difficulties upon the most patient and best tempered woman in the world how to bear such a husband with any affection or complaisance."

After the death of Mariamne, Herod endeavoured to banish the memory of his crimes by scenes of dissipation, but the recollection of her haunted him wherever he went, and he would frequently call aloud upon her name, and insist upon his attendants bringing her into his presence, as if she had been still among the living. Occasionally he fled from the sight of men, and on his return from solitude he became more tyrannical than ever, and spared neither friends nor foes. His mental anguish was increased by the ravages of a pestilence, which carried off multitudes of his subjects, B.C. 25. In this distress he secluded himself in Samaria, where he was attacked by a severe sickness. The physicians had given up all hopes of his recovery, and Alexandra attempted to gain possession of the fortifications of Jerusalem and the Temple, but her designs were discovered, and she was put to death, an unpitied victim of his rage. When his health was restored, the sufferings he had endured only increased the natural cruelty and ferocity of his temper. In the year B.C. 23, he found an opportunity of cutting off the last remote branch of the Asmonean race. This was Costobarus, the governor of Idumea and Gaza, who had married his sister Salome, and from whom she separated herself in an arbitrary manner, alleging as the cause that he had entered into a conspiracy against Herod. Costobarus and his associates were executed, and the last remains of the family of Hyrcanus were thus extirpated.

Herod had now freed himself of all claimants to the crown of Judea, and he ventured openly to introduce innovations upon the Jewish customs. He built a theatre and amphitheatre at Jerusalem, and instituted games which were celebrated every fifth year with great magnificence in honour of Augustus. The zealous Jews, who discovered Gentile profanation in the theatrical ornaments and spectacles, viewed them, and especially the combats between men and wild beasts, with great dissatisfaction. They

beheld with peculiar displeasure some military trophies suspended in the theatre in honour of Augustus, and in commemoration of his victories, but which the Jews regarded as images devoted to the purposes of idol worship. Ten Jews, one of whom was blind, formed a conspiracy, and assembled with daggers concealed under their garments to assassinate Herod as he entered the theatre, but their design was discovered, and they were put to death with the most cruel tortures. The informer was torn in pieces by a party who had united for that purpose, but Herod put those offenders also to the rack, and executed them and their families.

Well aware that he had alienated the affections of the Jews, Herod found it necessary to erect fortresses for his own security throughout the country. He fortified Samaria, which had been destroyed by John Hyrcanus, and afterwards rebuilt by the order of Gabinius. He called this ancient capital of the kings of the Ten Tribes *Sebaste*, which means *Augusta*, in honour of Augustus—a name which it retains to the present time. He also fortified Strato's Tower in the Plain of Esdraelon, which he designated *Cæsarea* in honour of that Emperor, and built Gaba in Galilee, and Heshbon in the district then called *Perea*. In the year B.C. 22, he gained the applause of his subjects by various acts of generosity, which would probably have gone far to obliterate all remembrance of his tyranny if the reformation had been permanent. During that year the usual rains did not fall in Syria and Judea, and a severe famine ensued, which was followed by a mortal pestilence. He exhausted his treasury and even his silver plate to purchase provisions, which he obtained from Egypt by the favour of his friend Petronius, the governor of that province. Most of the sheep in the country were slaughtered, both on account of the scarcity, and because the drought had destroyed the pasturage; but Herod at his own expense bought great quantities of wool, and distributed it among his

people for clothing. After the country had recovered from the ravages of famine and pestilence, he laid the foundation of a palace on Mount Zion, which was finished in the most splendid manner in the Grecian style of architecture. He next built a castellated palace, which he called Herodium, on a small round hill some miles distant from Jerusalem, near the place where he repulsed his enemies when pursuing him in his flight from that city some years before. At the foot of this hill a city gradually rose, in consequence of the neighbourhood of the castle, the beauty of the situation, and other appropriate advantages. He decorated Cæsarea with a theatre, an amphitheatre, and a temple to Augustus, and at a great expense formed for it a convenient harbour. Herod appears to have been ambitious of immortalizing his name by his buildings, and he accordingly erected many splendid edifices in cities not included in his dominions. Among these were the gymnasiums at Ptolemais, Tripolis, and Damascus; the city walls at Byblus; porticoes or covered walls at Tyre, Berytus, and Antioch; temples, bazaars, and theatres at Sidon and Damascus, an aqueduct at Laodicea on the sea, and baths, reservoirs, and porticoes at Ashkelon. He also planted groves in several cities; to others he made rich presents, and furnished them with money to support their games.

To supply the place of his lost Mariamne, Herod married a lady of the same name, the beautiful daughter of a priest called Simon, whom he elevated to the high priesthood. About this time he sent to Rome his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, whom he had by the murdered Mariamne, to be educated there, and Augustus received them with every mark of favour. He so completely ingratiated himself with the Emperor, that he was appointed imperial procurator in Syria, was permitted to nominate his own successor to the throne, and put in possession of the districts of Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Batanea, which had been infested with banditti. Those districts

had been farmed to a tetrarch called Zenodorus, who had participated in the spoils of the robbers, and the surrounding countries were continually disturbed by their depredations. Herod immediately applied himself to quell their disorders. Zenodorus, who had been deprived of his possessions, complained at Rome of his wrongs, but he was disregarded. He then instigated the Gadarenes to send an embassy to Mitylene in the island of Lesbos, to prefer the same complaints to Agrippa, the favourite of Augustus. But Herod was there before him, and so completely gained the friendship of Agrippa, who had been made governor of all the East by Augustus, that when the ambassadors arrived they were put in chains, and sent to Herod himself, who dismissed them without punishment. In the spring of the year B.C. 18, Augustus proceeded through Asia Minor. When he arrived at the Syrian Antioch, Zenodorus and the Gadarenes applied to him, and accused Herod of violence and sacrilege. The Emperor, however, would listen to none of their representations, and Zenodorus was dispatched by poison. Here Herod received in addition the principality of Chalcis, and his brother Pheroras was raised to the dignity of a tetrarch. In gratitude for these favours he built a temple of white marble at Paneas, and dedicated it to Augustus, while, to pacify the Jews, who looked upon that temple in their own country with considerable uneasiness, he took off a third part of their tribute.

The innovations of Herod, particularly in building idolatrous temples, nevertheless proved a constant source of dissatisfaction to the Jews; and though he excused himself by pleading the necessity of giving way to the Roman power, his subjects gave no credit to his statement. He was at last obliged to forbid all assemblages of the people under severe penalties. He maintained a great number of spies, and it is said that he even frequently went about in disguise by night, that he might learn the senti-

ments of the public on his actions. He brought to punishment the most refractory, and many were both publicly and privately put to death in the castle of Hyrcanium. Notwithstanding these exertions, however, his dangers continually increased, and he resolved for the sake of security to require all his subjects to take an oath of allegiance. Those who refused were executed, but the Essenes and the Pharisees were exempted, because the former esteemed all oaths unlawful, and the Pharisees were supposed to be well affected.

In the year B.C. 16, Herod resolved to gain the affections of the Jews, and acquire a lasting name in their history, by erecting a new temple at Jerusalem, in a larger and much more magnificent style than the old one. He intimated his design to the people, and finding that no credit was given to his assertions, he promised not to demolish the old Temple till all the materials for the new one were ready. The collection of these occupied two years, when the Temple was gradually taken down, and replaced by new buildings. The main body of the edifice was completed in nine years and a half, but the whole was not finished till long after the death of Herod, as is noticed in St John's Gospel (ii. 20). About this time he introduced a law that all thieves should be sold as slaves, and sent out of the country. This rendered the Jews liable to serve Pagans, which was odious to the whole nation, and counteracted their gratitude for the erection of the new Temple.

During the progress of that work Herod went to Rome, B.C. 13, and on his way he stopped at Athens to witness the games. He settled a revenue on the inhabitants of Elis, to enable them to celebrate the Olympic Games with greater splendour, and they evinced their gratitude by constituting him president for life. He was honourably received by Augustus, and when he returned to Jerusalem he brought with him his sons, who had attained to manhood, and were well instructed in the sciences. He married

Alexander, the elder born, to Glaphyra, daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and his younger son Aristobulus he gave to Berenice, the daughter of his sister Salome.

In the years B.C. 12 and 11, we find Herod conducting Agrippa to Palestine from Asia Minor, whither he had proceeded to meet him, and showed him the cities of Sebaste, Alexandrium, Herodium, and others, all magnificently built in the Grecian style of architecture, and then conducted him to Jerusalem. He also met Agrippa at Sinope, and undertook a campaign with him to the Cimmerian Bosphorus, afterwards attending him through Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Phrygia, and Ionia, to Ephesus, where he successfully exerted himself in favour of all who presented petitions to the Roman general. Among those were the Jews of Ionia, who applied to Herod to obtain from Agrippa a confirmation of their religious freedom, exemption from military services, and other privileges, which they had almost entirely lost. Herod, who thought by espousing their cause that he would obtain some credit in Judea, was successful in his application; and when he returned to Jerusalem he took care to inform the people assembled in the Temple of the good services he had rendered to their brethren in Ionia. Josephus has preserved the edicts which confirmed those Jews in their privileges.

Herod again became harassed by the turbulent projects of his family. His brother Pheroras and his sister Salome looked with envious eyes on his sons Alexander and Aristobulus, who were greatly beloved by the people. Those two princes had been heard to utter some incautious expressions respecting the murder of their mother Mariamne, which were repeated to Salome, and increased her hatred against them. In conjunction with Pheroras she excited the suspicions of Herod; occasions were artfully taken to draw out the sentiments of the unsuspecting princes; and whatever they said was reported with gross exaggerations to their father. He resolved to humble them by

assuming as a favourite Antipater, the son of his wife Doris, whom he had divorced before he married Mariamne, and gave him precedence before Alexander and Aristobulus, who in consequence became more violent in their language and behaviour. By various treacherous and designing means the suspicions of Herod became at length so strong, that about eight years before our Saviour's advent he carried them to Rome, whence he proceeded with them to Apuleia, where Augustus was then residing, and accused them of conspiring against his life. The Emperor at once perceived that the whole accusation rested on mere suspicion, and acquitted the princes, attempting at the same time to effect a reconciliation. When Herod returned to Jerusalem he convoked an assembly of the people in the Temple, in which he appointed Antipater his successor to the throne, and after him the two sons of Mariamne. This appointment increased the dissensions of his family, and by the machinations of Antipater, Salome, and Pheroras, he became so much afraid of the princes, that he could not rest either day or night. He put several of their friends to the torture, and some, to obtain relief from pain, made false declarations against Alexander, who was immediately imprisoned. That prince now resorted to an artifice, which was to a certain extent successful. He wrote four letters to his father, acknowledging that he had been in the conspiracy, and seriously implicating Pheroras, Salome, and others, who had filled his ear with calumnies against him. By this false confession Alexander destroyed the influence possessed by his enemies over his father, who the more readily believed his statement, because he implicated himself in the guilt of those whom he accused. In the midst of these domestic troubles, when Herod had executed some, and put others to the torture, to extort confession, King Archelaus, the father-in-law of Alexander, arrived at Jerusalem. When he was informed of the conspiracy, he affected the greatest indignation towards

him, threatening to take his daughter Glaphyra from him, and pretending to be more indignant at his conduct than Herod himself. By this assumed anger he completely deceived Herod, who now began with tears to intercede for his son. Archelaus thus contrived to bring about a complete reconciliation, and the king was so much affected by the friendly services of his guest, that he could scarcely express his gratitude.

Herod, who had written to Rome for permission to proceed by law against his sons, set out in person to that city to inform the Emperor of his forgiveness of them. During his absence the robbers, whom he had compelled to engage in agriculture, again made their appearance in several districts, pillaging and laying waste the country. They were protected by an Arab named Sylleus, the chief minister of Obodas, king of Petra, to be revenged on Herod, who had refused to give him his sister Salome in marriage because he was an uncircumcised Arab. A variety of transactions followed, in which Herod found the greatest difficulty in opposing those banditti. Some accusations were preferred against him to the Emperor, which were seriously entertained, until Augustus dismissed them all, and the king was restored to favour. He was about to bestow on Herod a large accession of territory in Arabia as a recompence for the harshness with which he had treated him, when he received a letter from him requesting permission to renew the legal process against Alexander and Aristobulus, alleging that he could not believe himself safe, although in reality nothing was proved against them except that they intended to provide for their own security by leaving the kingdom. Augustus saw the inexpediency of committing the government of another kingdom to a man who was incapable of ruling his own family; but he gave Herod full power to proceed against his sons, who were already arrested, in his own way, though he advised him to consult the chiefs of the neighbouring provinces, and particularly Archelaus,

king of Cappadocia. Herod summoned all the rulers mentioned in the Emperor's mandate to a council at Berytus, except Archelaus, whom, from his relationship to Alexander, he regarded as an interested party. The two unfortunate princes were condemned, and were sent to Sebaste, where they were strangled by the orders of their father.

No sooner had Herod's sons fallen a sacrifice to his suspicions, than he was exposed to new dangers by the treachery of other members of his family. Antipater and Pheroras—the former wishing to seize the crown, and the latter determined to be revenged on his brother for some domestic quarrels between them—entered into a conspiracy to poison him. The dissatisfaction of Herod towards Pheroras was increased by the wife of the latter paying from her own resources the fines of more than six thousand Pharisees, who had refused to take the oath of allegiance to him and Augustus, alleging that it was unlawful; and the Pharisees, grateful for this favour, were so imprudent as to whisper that God would yet give the kingdom to Pheroras. Herod caused several of them, and some of his own family, to be executed. He called upon Pheroras either to repudiate his wife, whom he accused as the cause of all these troubles, or to consider himself no longer as his brother; but Pheroras refused, and Herod prohibited Antipater and his mother from holding any farther intercourse with him. They nevertheless secretly continued their intimacy, though Pheroras withdrew to his own tetrarchy, and Antipater contrived to be summoned to Rome at the same time. It was arranged that Herod should be carried off by poison during their absence, but Pheroras fell sick soon afterwards, and died while visited by Herod. His death led to the discovery of the whole plot. His widow was accused of having poisoned him, and some of the female slaves of Pheroras were put to the torture to ascertain the truth. From their confessions it appeared that Antipater had prepared poison for Herod, which he had entrusted

to Pheroras, who had consigned it to the care of his wife until a fit opportunity occurred of administering it to the king. She confessed her guilt at her first examination, and immediately after threw herself from the roof of her house; but she survived the fall, and gave a full relation of the whole circumstances, adding that her husband Pheroras on his death-bed, deeply affected by the friendly visit of the king, had ordered her to throw the poison into the fire in his presence, and that she had done so, reserving only a little for herself, which she showed to Herod. About this time a freedman of Antipater named Bathyllus arrived from Rome with letters from his master, in which he attempted to excite the suspicions of Herod against his other sons Archelaus and Philip. The freedman was put to the torture, and acknowledged that he had brought with him a still stronger poison, which he was ordered to deliver to Pheroras. This discovery made Herod divorce Mariamne, the daughter of Simon, who was ascertained to be an accomplice in the conspiracy. He also erased the name of her son from his will, deposed her father Simon from the high priesthood, and gave this office to Matthias.

In the beginning of the last year of Herod's reign, or at the close of the preceding one, our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST came into the world. Sentius Saturninus was, at the time of this great and illustrious event, Proconsul in Syria, and Sulpicius Quirinus, called Cyrenius (*Κυρηνιος*) by St Luke, in Cilicia. A census of the Roman Empire, such as that mentioned by the Evangelist as having taken place, was a common occurrence during the reign of Augustus, who was constantly active in all that concerned the immense empire under his care. Livy notices several disturbances which took place in Gaul on account of a census taken there; and Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius, intimate that similar measures were pursued in other provinces to ascertain the strength of the Empire. St Luke (ii. 1, 2) states that a census of

this kind was taken in Judea at the time of our Saviour's birth under Saturninus, but as it occasioned no disturbance it was not remarkable, and the Evangelist carefully distinguishes it from the celebrated census taken twelve years afterwards under Sulpicius Quirinus, which excited an insurrection. From several circumstances stated by Dr Lardner, it appears that our Saviour was born about one year and six months before the death of Herod, but the year of Rome in which it took place is uncertain. Cato placed the building of Rome in the fourth year of the sixth or the first year of the seventh Olympiad, and this computation makes the birth of Christ to have taken place in the seven hundred and fifty-second year of Rome; Varro fixes the building of the city in the third year of the sixth Olympiad, and this makes the advent of our Saviour in the seven hundred and fifty-fourth year of Rome. A Continental chronologist of great accuracy fixes it in the seven hundred and fiftieth year of Rome. From these calculations it appears that the difference is trifling, and perfect accuracy can scarcely be expected.

Much has been said about the situation of the world at the time of our Saviour's advent, and it is unnecessary here to advert particularly to the various eloquent and learned disquisitions on the interesting subject. The reader in the preceding narrative will form a tolerably correct idea of the state of Judea, when the sceptre had "departed from Shiloh, and a lawgiver from between his feet"—when the royal family of David had become lowly and obscure, and "David's Son and David's Lord" was born in the little city of Bethlehem, and appeared, as he in reality was, humanly speaking, the last and final representative of the ancient regal line of Judah. The assertion that the temple of Janus was shut at Rome when this great event took place, because there was peace throughout the Roman Empire rests only on the authority of Orosius, a writer of the fifth century. We have the most convincing evidence,

however, that a universal sovereign was expected to arise in Judea, and it is admitted by all that the Jews themselves were looking anxiously for the appearance of the Messiah.

Some modern writers have strangely doubted the fact of the massacre of the children of Bethlehem by Herod's order, and it has been thought surprising that Josephus, who was no friend to Herod, makes no mention of it whatever. But Josephus was a Jewish, not a Christian author, and he was, it is more than probable, unacquainted with the motives which induced the king to commit this great barbarity. Nor is it strange that he should pass it over in silence even if he knew it, for the murder of the children of Bethlehem could excite comparatively little attention among the other and far greater cruelties of Herod, especially as Bethlehem was a small town with few inhabitants. We have seen, throughout the preceding narrative of Herod's life, that he was at all times a jealous and suspicious tyrant, who spared neither friends nor foes, not scrupling to put to death his own sons, and that he was at all times particularly jealous about any rivals to the throne. The whole transaction corresponds with his character, and we need not be surprised that his vindictiveness should prompt him to the murder of infants of whom he knew nothing. The arrival of the Wise Men, or Eastern Magi, at Jerusalem had attracted his attention; he was well aware of the general expectation which prevailed of the appearance of the Messiah, or of a great and universal deliverer, and he would naturally conclude, from his suspicious and ferocious temper, that this might be some new conspiracy formed against him either by his own family, or by the Jews themselves, who held him in the utmost detestation. When he found that the Wise Men did not return to Jerusalem and report what they had witnessed, his cruel disposition was at once manifested. He "sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had dili-

gently inquired of the Wise Men." This extending of the massacre to children of two years old seems to have arisen from an excess of precaution quite characteristic of Herod, in order to compass with the greater certainty the death of the infant whom he dreaded. By his barbarous procedure he plunged himself into the deepest guilt, and entailed upon himself endless infamy, without gaining the point at which he aimed; for that illustrious Infant, whom alone he wished to destroy, escaped him, and the Holy Innocents of Bethlehem and "its coasts" are commemorated by the Church as the first victims to the impious rage of that ferocious tyrant who "sought the young child to destroy him."

About this time Antipater returned from Rome filled with fears and gloomy apprehensions, and immediately on his arrival he was reproached by Herod for having procured the execution of the innocent sons of Mariamne, and for conspiring to destroy him (Herod) by poison. Quintilius Varus, prefect of Syria, was then at Jerusalem, and Antipater was accused before him; the crimes of which he was impeached were clearly proved, and he was thrown into prison until the judgment of the Emperor was ascertained.

Herod was in the meantime labouring under the sickness which soon proved fatal. His unhappy and ferocious disposition, the conspiracies, real or imaginary, formed against him, the domestic broils of his family, and other calamities, preyed upon the broken constitution of a prince in his sixty-ninth year, and threw him into a mortal disease, which has been represented by Josephus, Eusebius, and others, as a just judgment of Heaven on the many enormities and impieties of which he was guilty. He made his will, in which he appointed his youngest son Antipas his successor, purposely excluding his sons Archelaus and Philip, in consequence of the slanders of Antipater. A premature report of his death caused a tumult in Jerusalem, excited by Judas and Matthias, two celebrated teach-

ers, who were impatient to demolish a golden eagle which he had placed over the gate of the Temple. The perpetrators of this imprudent act were seized and put to death by order of the king.

The disorder of Herod was attended with most loathsome circumstances. The rectum and intestines were ulcerated, his feet were swollen, various parts of his body gangrened, and filled with worms, his breath was short and fetid, and he was subject to frequent convulsions; yet he had a most unnatural appetite for food. The warm baths of Calirrhœ, recommended by his physicians, were ineffectual, and an oil bath next resorted to threw him into a fainting fit which nearly proved fatal. He now gave up all hopes of recovery, and after distributing presents among his servants and followers, he returned to Jericho. The reproaches of his conscience increased the natural cruelty of his disposition. He knew that the Jews would rejoice at his death, and he therefore summoned around him the principal men of the nation, against whom he had devised a plot which proves his ferocity of disposition, and his competence to massacre the innocent children of Bethlehem. He charged his sister Salome and her husband Alexas to confine those persons of distinction in the hippodrome, and to put them all to death as soon as he drew his last breath—"for this," he said, "will provide mourners for my funeral all over the land, and make the Jews in every family lament my death, who would otherwise exhibit no signs of concern."

Letters were now received from the Emperor Augustus, giving Herod full power to proceed against Antipater. He appeared to revive when this intelligence was announced, but he soon relapsed, and made an attempt to commit suicide. He was withheld from the execution of his purpose, yet the customary cry was raised throughout the palace as if he was really dead. Antipater heard these lamentations, and attempted to bribe his guard, by offering a large sum of money to permit him to escape from prison, but he

was so much detested, that the guard even made his offers known, and Herod ordered him to be immediately executed. The king now made a new will, and he appointed Archelaus his successor in the kingdom. Antipater was nominated to the tetrarchy of Perea and Galilee, and Philip to that of Batanea (the ancient Bashan), Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, and Paneas, at the springs of the Jordan. He gave the towns of Jamnia, Azotus, and Phasaelis, to his sister Salome, with five hundred thousand silver coins, and to all his other relatives he left legacies of money and revenues. He bequeathed to the Emperor, who once remarked that "his soul was too great for his kingdom," ten millions of silver coins, probably denarii, a great quantity of gold and silver plate, and the most valuable part of his wardrobe; and to the Empress Julia and some others five millions of silver coins of the same value.

Herod died in the second year after our blessed Saviour's advent, a short time before the feast of the Passover, on the fifth day after the execution of his son Antipater, in the thirty-seventh year of his reign and the seventieth of his age. Before the public announcement of his death, his sister Salome and her husband chose rather to break the oath extorted from them by the tyrant, than be implicated in such a barbarous deed, and they set all the persons of distinction shut up in the hippodrome at liberty, as if by the order of Herod. His body, under an escort of his own guards, composed of Thracians, Germans, and Gauls, was carried to Herodium, and there buried.

Herod had two wives whose names are not mentioned in history. His other wives were—Doris, the mother of Antipater—Mariamne, of the Asmonean family, who was the mother of Alexander, Aristobulus, a third son whose name is not mentioned, and of two daughters, Salampso and Cypros—Marianne, daughter of Simon, who bore him one son—Malthace of Samaria, the mother of Archelaus and Herod Antipas, and of their sister Olympias—Cleopatra of Jerusalem,

the mother of Herod and Philip—Pallas, the mother of Phasael—Phædra, the mother of Roxane—and Elpis, the mother of Salome.

The memory of Herod has been consigned to merited detestation, while his abilities and the glories of his eventful reign have placed him high in the rank of distinguished sovereigns. He was magnificent to profuseness, nor was he altogether destitute of generosity and gratitude. In his own person he exhibited a combination of great talents and enormous depravity. He appears to have delighted in revolting and horrible acts of vengeance, and his savage disposition prompted him to the most inhuman acts of cruelty. He was the first who shook the foundations of the Jewish government. He broke the rightful order of succession of the high priests, appointing and removing them at pleasure; and he completely destroyed the authority of the Sanhedrim, or great national council. His reign was similar to that of many tyrants—splendid and glorious to outward appearance, but in reality most destructive of the prosperity of the kingdom which he governed. He introduced several idolatrous usages to ingratiate himself with Augustus and the Romans, though to the Jews he pretended that he did so against his will, and in compliance with the imperial command. This symbolizing with idolatry, on account of worldly interest and policy, was probably that *leaven* of Herod against which our Saviour cautioned his disciples. Hence, according to the judicious arguments of the learned Prideaux, the origin of the sect called the *Herodians*, mentioned by St Matthew and St Mark (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark iii. 6; viii. 15; xii. 13), but passed over in silence by Josephus and Philo. Interpreters are indeed divided with regard to them, some making them to be a political party, and others a religious sect; but Prideaux has satisfactorily proved that they derived their name from Herod the Great, and that they were distinguished from the mass of the Jews by their concurrence with Herod's schemes

of subjecting himself and his dominions to the Romans, and complying with many of their customs and usages. They were, in fact, the *court party* in the reign of Herod, and being thus *political*, it is not surprising that they are omitted by Josephus in his account of the Jewish sects. In their zeal for the Roman authority, for which they were probably rewarded by places and preferments, they were completely opposite to the Pharisees, who esteemed it unlawful to submit or to pay tribute to the Roman Emperor—an opinion which they grounded on a peculiar interpretation of their Law, prohibiting them, as they alleged, from having a stranger to be their king. The conjunction of the Herodians and the Pharisees against our Saviour, therefore, is a memorable proof of their resentment against him. They united together in an attempt to ensnare him on a subject which was the ground of their mutual dissension—whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar. If our Saviour answered in the negative, the Herodians would have accused him of treason against the state; and if in the affirmative, the Pharisees were as ready to excite the people against him as an enemy to their civil liberties and privileges. Hardouin contends that the Herodians and the Sadducees were the same, and it is not improbable that they were chiefly of that sect, for that which is called by St Mark the *leaven of Herod*, in our Saviour's caution to his disciples, is by St Matthew designated the *leaven of the Sadducees*.

HEROD AGRIPPA, the son of Aristobulus, and grandson of Herod the Great, was made king of Iturea, Trachonitis, and other provinces, by the Emperor Caligula, to which the Emperor Claudius added Judea and Samaria. See AGRIPPA.

HEROD ANTIPAS, the son of Herod the Great by Malthace of Samaria, was left by his father the tetrarchate of Perea and Galilee. He had been appointed his successor in the kingdom in the first will made by Herod, but in the second he was supplanted by Archelaus, his brother by the same mother. Antipas

was at Rome, with a powerful party to support his claims to the kingdom, when Archelaus arrived to obtain the ratification of his father's second will by the Emperor. The rest of the family of Herod the Great were opposed to the establishment or continuance of a regal government in Judea, but they had resolved that if they were obliged to have a king, they would rather prefer Herod Antipas to Archelaus. Augustus listened to the claims of both parties, and deferred his judgment until he more carefully investigated the matter. In a few days he confirmed the second will of Herod, in which Archelaus was nominated his successor, and Antipas was appointed tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, with an annual revenue of about two hundred talents.

Herod Antipas is the Herod mentioned by St Luke, who says, that "when the word of God came to John in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, Herod was tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea," which intimates that they were in possession of the same territories assigned them by their father's will, and ratified by Augustus; and this is the same Herod who beheaded John the Baptist, and to whom our blessed Saviour was sent by Pontius Pilate. On discovering that Jesus belonged to the district of Galilee in the dominion of Herod, and probably reflecting that by his acquaintance with the Jewish religion he was more competent to take cognizance of the case, Pilate referred the hearing of the accusations against our Saviour to him, as he was then at Jerusalem attending the feast of the Passover. The Evangelical historian informs us that, "when Herod saw Jesus he was exceeding glad, for he was desirous to see him of a long season, because he had heard many things of him, and he hoped to have seen some miracle done by him;" but before Herod our Saviour conducted himself with the same dignity and the same patient endurance of wrongs which became his peculiar situation, refusing to gratify the idle curiosity of the tetrarch by work-

ing a miracle, and to give him that account of his life and ministry which might have been credited on the authority of others. Herod, according to the express statement of Pilate, found "no fault" in our Saviour "touching those things whereof they accused him," but he ordered him to be exhibited as a mock king by his military attendants, and sent him back to Pilate arrayed in a gorgeous robe. This transaction made Pilate and Herod "friends together, for before they were at enmity between themselves," dissensions being frequent between the various kings and governors throughout the Roman Empire.

Josephus informs us that Herod Antipas built the city of Tiberias on the lake of that name—that he fortified and adorned Sepphoris, and made it the capital of Galilee—and that he also fortified Betharamphtha, and called it Julia, after the name of the Empress. In A.D. 39, the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, and the third of the administration of Pilate, John the Baptist made his appearance, and endeavoured, by producing a reformation among the people, to prepare them for the reception of the Messiah. On the following year he baptized Jesus at the Jordan, and pointed him out to his countrymen as the promised Saviour. At this time a war broke out between Herod Antipas and Aretas, the Arabian king of Petra, which was occasioned by the conduct of the former. Herod had married a daughter of Aretas, but while on his journey to Rome he visited his half-brother, a son of his father Herod the Great by Mariamne, the daughter of the high priest Simon, and commenced an intrigue with his wife Herodias, a daughter of Aristobulus, the son of the murdered Mariamne of the Asmonean family, whom he promised to marry, and to repudiate the daughter of Aretas. While, however, Herod was absent at Rome, the Arabian princess heard of the fate which awaited her and fled to her father at Petra. Herod, on his return from Rome, married Herodias, and the irritated Aretas commenced

hostilities by raising some difficulties respecting the boundaries of Gamalis. Some of Herod's soldiers during their march listened to the instructions of John the Baptist, and, betrayed by deserters, the army of Herod was defeated, routed, and dispersed. He carried on this war to his disadvantage four years.

The marriage of Herod Antipas with his half-brother's wife, who was also his own niece, disgusted his subjects, and drew upon him the stern and indignant reproaches of John the Baptist, which occasioned the imprisonment by Herod of that illustrious forerunner of our blessed Saviour. But the imprisonment of the Baptist was not deemed a sufficient punishment by Herodias. Irritated at his undaunted condemnation of her criminal conduct, she laid a snare for his life. At the celebration of Herod's birthday, the daughter of Herodias, named Salome, danced before him in public, according to a very ancient custom of kings in the East on festival occasions. Her appearance so greatly pleased and delighted Herod, that he "promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask." The excellent Bishop Porteus appropriately remarks that the folly, the rashness, and the madness of such an oath as this, on so foolish an occasion, could be exceeded by nothing but the horrible purpose to which it was perverted by her to whom it was given, and her profligate instructor. Herodias had previously instructed her daughter to demand the head of the Baptist in a "charger," or large dish, conformable to the frequent mode of execution in Oriental countries. St Matthew informs us that Herod would have previously put the Baptist to death, but the fear of the people, who greatly revered the distinguished teacher, prevented him, yet this savage demand appalled him; he was unprepared for such a request, or to proceed to such an extremity against him:—"nevertheless, for the oath's sake, and them that sat at meat, he commanded it to be given her; and he sent and beheaded John in the prison; and his head was brought in :

charger, and given to the damsel, and she brought it to her mother." "Herod," says Bishop Porteus, "instead of retracting by the only way he had left—that of retracting a promise which it was madness to make, and the extremity of wickedness to perform, was induced by a false point of honour, as worthless men frequently are, to commit an atrocious murder rather than violate a rash oath—an oath which could never make that right which was before intrinsically wrong, and which could never bind him to any thing in itself unlawful, much less to the most unlawful of all things—the destruction of an innocent and virtuous man."

Josephus thus narrates this inhuman action of Herod—"Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, for what he did against John the Baptist; for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and taught the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another, and piety toward God, and so to come to baptism; that the washing with water would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins only, but for the purification of the body, supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. When many others came in crowds about him, for they were greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it in his power and inclination to raise rebellion, for they seemed ready to do any thing he should advise, thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it was too late. Accordingly, he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machærus, and was there put to death." The difference between this narrative and that of the Evangelists need occasion no difficulty. Josephus wrote nearly fifty years after the event he describes, when

the true causes of the execution of the Baptist were not so well known as they were by the contemporary disciples of our Saviour, some of whom had been followers of John, and would not neglect to ascertain all the circumstances connected with the death of their distinguished and venerated teacher.

The ambition of Herodias was eventually the ruin of Herod. Their relation, Herod Agrippa, had obtained regal honours from the Emperor, and she was desirous of the same distinctions for her husband. For this purpose she persuaded him, much against his inclination, to take a journey to Rome; but when he arrived in the imperial city he was accused of being concerned in the conspiracy of Sejanus, and instead of returning home a king, he was deprived of all his dominions, and banished to Lyons, where it is conjectured he died. His wife was offered her liberty by the Emperor, but she preferred accompanying her husband into exile. Herod Antipas possessed his tetrarchy forty-three years.

HERODIAS, the wife of the tetrarch Herod Antipas, is particularly noticed in the preceding article. Bishop Porteus makes some admirable remarks on her conduct with reference to John the Baptist, and the instructions she gave to her daughter Salome, which are peculiarly appropriate.—"We see here a fatal proof of the extreme barbarities to which that most diabolical sentiment of revenge will drive the natural tenderness even of a female mind—what a close connection there is between crimes of apparently a very different complexion—and how frequently the uncontrolled indulgence of what are called the softer affections leads ultimately to the most violent excesses of the malignant passions. We also find here a most awful warning held out not only to the female sex but to both sexes—to persons of all ages and conditions—to beware giving way to any one evil propensity in their nature, however indulgently it may be treated by the world, and however much it may be authorised by general practice, because it is here

seen, that they may not only be led into the grossest extravagancies of that individual passion, but may also be insensibly betrayed into the commission of crimes of the deepest dye, which in their serious moments they always contemplated with the utmost horror."

HEZEKIAH, king of Judah, was the son and successor of Ahaz. He nobly destroyed the idolatry introduced by his father, who had regarded nothing but his own depraved inclinations, and had set at defiance all the restraints imposed by the Mosaic Law on the Hebrew kings. Hezekiah immediately after his accession opened the Temple, restored the worship of God, overthrew the brazen serpent of Moses which had become an object of superstition, and the altar illegally erected to Jehovah, and caused the festivals to be regularly celebrated. He invited to the feasts those Hebrews who still remained in the kingdom of Israel, which had been conquered in the sixth year of his reign; and, imitating the example of his great ancestor David, he provided for the religious instruction and moral improvement of the people by the public singing of psalms in the Temple, and by a new collection of the moral maxims of Solomon. His piety was rewarded by the peace and prosperity of his kingdom. He conquered the Philistines, who had penetrated into the southern parts of Judea during the reign of his father, and shook off the Assyrian yoke, to which his father had voluntarily submitted. In Jerusalem he extended the fortifications and magazines, and supplied the city more plentifully with water by a new aqueduct. The inspired historian emphatically informs us that "the Lord was with him, and he prospered whithersoever he went forth."

In the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came with a large army to reduce Judah to obedience, and then to march to the conquest of Egypt. We are told that he "came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them." Hezekiah thought it prudent to submit to the

victorious invader, and agreed to pay the tribute imposed on him by Sennacherib, of three hundred talents of silver and thirty of gold. It appears that this excellent king was reduced to the greatest necessity by the Assyrian invasion, for he gave Sennacherib "all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house;" and he even "cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord, and from the pillars which he had himself overlaid." To understand this sudden reverse in the prosperous fortunes of Hezekiah, it is necessary to observe that his revolt from the Assyrian domination happened during the reign of Shalmanezzer, the father of Sennacherib, who, however, was too much engaged in other affairs—probably the siege of Tyre—to take such strong measures against the Hebrew king as his son now adopted. It farther appears that Hezekiah had been encouraged in his revolt by some vague promises of assistance from Egypt, which were never fulfilled, 2 Kings xviii. 24. There are several intimations, in this part of the inspired history, of the great alarm with which the Egyptians regarded the westward march of the Assyrians, and it was evidently their policy to divert the attention of this formidable enemy from themselves, by exciting the intervening tributary states to revolt.

After Sennacherib had gained possession of Ashdod, which may be appropriately designated the key to Egypt, he resolved, in his invasion of that country, to complete the subjugation of the kingdom of Judah which lay in his rear, and which had already revolted. He soon reduced all the most important places, except Libnah and Lachish, to which he laid siege, and at the same time he sent his general Rabshakeh to Jerusalem with a haughty summons to surrender. This warrior was accompanied by Tartan and Rabсарis, and appeared before the metropolis with a numerous and well-disciplined army, resolved to achieve its conquest. The name of Rabshakeh imports that he was the king of Assyria's cup-

bearer, but by his familiarity with the Hebrew language it is conjectured that he was an apostate Jew, and one of those who were made captive from the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. Rabshakeh and his colleagues stationed themselves at a most advantageous part without the walls of Jerusalem, near the conduit or canal into which water was conveyed from the upper pool, in the highway to the field where the fullers usually spread their clothes for drying. From this place they summoned the city, and demanded a conference with the king. Hezekiah wisely declined to appear, but he sent a deputation, consisting of Eleakim, who held the chief situation in his household, Shebna, his "scribe" or secretary, and Joah, the recorder of genealogies. Rabshakeh conducted himself to the deputation in the most boasting and insolent manner, magnifying the power of his master, declaring the impossibility of deliverance from his vengeance, and advising them to give pledges to the king of Assyria. All this was expressed in language of the utmost contempt and ridicule of Hezekiah's power. Eleakim and his companions, afraid that the people who were within hearing of Rabshakeh might be alarmed by this boasting address, requested him to speak in the Syrian language—the same now called the Chaldee—since he was not sent to treat with the populace, but with the king and his ministers, who well understood the Syrian tongue. The Assyrian general, however, refused to comply with this request in the most contemptuous and insulting manner, and addressed a violent harangue to the people within hearing, disclaiming to take any farther notice of the deputation, advising them not to be deceived by the representations of Hezekiah, promising them that if they would seek the favour of the king of Assyria, by making him a liberal present and delivering themselves up to his mercy, they would be transferred to a better country than that to which the conquered Ten Tribes had been taken, and that in the meantime every one

would enjoy his own possessions. He also argued on the then popular supposition that the God of Israel—the great God of heaven and earth—was like the idols of other nations, who were supposed to preside over particular districts and cities. "Where," he asked, "are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Heva, and Ivah? have they delivered Samaria out of mine hand? Who are they among all the gods of the countries that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?" This speech, which abounded with allusions to the well known conquests of the Assyrians, was heard in solemn silence by the people, Hezekiah having issued a peremptory order to that effect. The deputation returned to the king with their clothes rent, to express their abhorrence at the blasphemous insult offered to Jehovah and their religion, and in the utmost alarm at the danger with which they were threatened.

The proceedings of Hezekiah at this crisis are fully narrated by the sacred historians. Though to all human appearance every thing was lost, he relied on the promise of deliverance announced to him by the Prophet Isaiah, and this was soon accomplished in a manner which corresponded to the implicit confidence of the king. A report was circulated that Tirhakah, king of Cush, was on his march through Arabia to attack the Assyrians, and soon after one hundred and eighty-five thousand of Sennacherib's army were cut off in one night. It is nowhere expressly stated in what manner this great mortality was caused, and a variety of conjectures have been offered—that it was done by a plague—by thunder and lightning—by fire from heaven—and by encountering each other in the darkness and obscurity of the night. But by whatsoever means the defeat was effected, it is expressly stated that it was done by the agency of a destroying angel. In the account of the calamity in the Prophecy of Isaiah, Sennacherib

is threatened with a *blast* to be sent by God upon his army, and it is now generally supposed that the hot scorching wind called the *simoom* was the *blast* which caused this stupendous destruction. Sennacherib fled to Assyria, and was soon afterwards murdered by two of his sons in the temple of the idol Nis-roch at Nineveh. By these disasters the Assyrian power was greatly weakened, for we find that Esar-haddon, the successor of Sennacherib, made no attempts against the kingdom of Judah.

Some time either before or after this great deliverance from the Assyrians, Hezekiah was attacked with a plague, and there was so little hope of his recovery that Isaiah earnestly requested him to make his will. He addressed the king in those ominous and well known words—"Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live." Hezekiah heard the announcement with the feeling which shows that love of life is natural to man, and that the fear of death is deeply implanted in the human frame and constitution. "The best of men," says the excellent Bishop Hall, "cannot strip himself of some flesh, and while nature has an undeniable share in him, he cannot but retain some sense of the sweetness of life, and of the horrors of dissolution. Both these were in Hezekiah, but neither of them could transport him to such excess of grief. They were higher feelings which swayed so holy a prince—a tender care of the glory of God, and a strong pity for the church of God." It should be farther recollected that the intimation to Hezekiah—*thou shalt surely die*—was not absolute and irreversible, and rather implied a tacit condition, that if he humbled himself the time of his death would be deferred.

Isaiah was instructed to inform the king that he would recover, and that fifteen years would be added to his life. Hezekiah requested a miracle for the confirmation of this promise, and the shadow of the stile went back ten degrees on the dial of Ahaz. This prolonging of the king's life was of the more consequence,

because at that time there was no heir to the crown. The event was recorded in the annals of the nation, and celebrated in a thanksgiving ode by Hezekiah. In conjunction with the remarkable deliverance from Sennacherib, it not only restored the Jews from any lingering attachment to the idolatry introduced by Ahaz, and retained them for some time in their attachment to the service of Jehovah, but it attracted the attention and excited the admiration of the neighbouring nations. Merodach-baladan, son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sent ambassadors to Jerusalem to congratulate him on his recovery, and on his deliverance from Sennacherib, and to make inquiry respecting this miracle. Hezekiah was so imprudent, "in the pride of his heart," as to make a vain display of his wealth to the ambassadors, and his conduct was severely reprov'd by Isaiah at the Divine command, who intimated to him what the Babylonians would afterwards do to his family. He on this occasion received the melancholy prediction of the Captivity, and at a time, moreover, when Babylon was an inconsiderable kingdom, and when the people who were to fulfil the prediction were almost unknown. Hezekiah heard the announcement with great humility and religious composure of mind, acknowledging the justice of the Divine declaration, and confessing his gratitude that it would not be inflicted in his own time, and that he was to be privileged to live and die in peace. He said to Isaiah—"Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken;" and farther—"Is it not good, if peace and truth shall be all my days?" The reply of this excellent prince to the Prophet is thus paraphrased by Bishop Hall:—"Thou hast spoken the word, but from the Lord. It is not thine, but His; and being His, it must needs be, like Himself, good—good, because it is just, for I have deserved more, and worse—good, because it is merciful, for I suffer not according to my deserts."

Nothing more is recorded of the reign and personal history of Hezekiah. The

inspired historian informs us—"And the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and all his might, and how he made a pool, and a conduit, and brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah? And Hezekiah slept with his fathers, and Manasseh his son reigned in his stead." In reference to the prediction uttered against him by Isaiah for his vain display to the Babylonian ambassadors, Professor Jahn has a most appropriate observation. "If any one be inclined to interpret this prophecy as alluding to the imprisonment of Manasseh at Babylon, whither he was carried by the Assyrians, he need only read the words of Isaiah to be convinced that the prediction refers to some far more important events, which were first brought about by the Chaldeans."

HIEL, a native of Bethel, who during the reign of Ahab rebuilt Jericho, and his family experienced the fulfilment of the ban denounced by Joshua against any one who should attempt to restore that devoted city. The inspired historian informs us, that "he laid the foundation thereof in Abiram his first-born, and set up the gates thereof in his youngest son Segub, according to the word of the Lord, which he spake by Joshua the son of Nun." Nothing more is recorded of this person and his family. "Hiel," says Bishop Patrick, "being an inhabitant of Bethel, lived in the very heart of idolatry, and was probably deeply infected with it. He either did not know (because ignorant of the Law, which was now little read) the judgments of God denounced against the rebuilders of Jericho, or he was so impious as not to regard them, believing no other God but Baal. He soon, however, found those judgments to be true. This is a most remarkable instance of the certainty of Divine threatenings, as the sentence, though pronounced four hundred and forty years before, was now fulfilled in all its circumstances; and assuredly it ought to have been an awful warning to the whole nation not to despise the long-suffering and patience of God, who, though he had not

yet carried them out of their good land, according to the word of Ahijah, 1 Kings xiv. 15, would certainly do so if they continued in hardened impenitence."

HIRAM, king of Tyre, a contemporary of David and Solomon, is noticed as living on the most intimate terms of friendship with those Hebrew monarchs, and as a most important auxiliary in procuring materials for the erection of the Temple. Both he and Solomon are mentioned by Menander of Ephesus, who derived his information from the original sources preserved in each of the nations of which he wrote. He celebrates Hiram, or, as he calls him, Hiromos, as a lover of architecture and a hero, and Solomon as a distinguished sage. The passage from this ancient historian, quoted by Josephus against Apion, is remarkable. "Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hiram took the kingdom: he lived fifty-three years, and reigned thirty-four. He raised a bank on that called the Broad Place, and dedicated the golden pillar which is in Jupiter's (Baal's) temple; he also went and cut down timber from the mountain called Libanus, and got timber of cedar for the roofs of the temples. He also pulled down the old temples and built new ones; besides this, he consecrated the temples of Hercules and Astarte. He first built the temple of Hercules in the month Peritus, and that of Astarte when he made his expedition against the Tityans, who refused to pay him tribute; and when he had subdued them he returned home. Under this king there was a younger son of Abdeemon, who by his acuteness mastered the problems which Solomon, king of Jerusalem, had recommended to be solved." Diodorus, another ancient writer, records similar particulars. "Although Menander," observes an author, "here says nothing of the building of the Temple of Jerusalem, it is easy to see how exactly every other circumstance corresponds with the Biblical history. It also plainly appears that it was then customary to erect magnificent temples. We may even conjecture that Menander confounded the Temple of Jehovah at

Jerusalem with the temple of Jupiter at Tyre." Josephus (against Apion) thus enumerates the kings of Tyre who were the successors of Hiram, on the authority of the Tyrian annals—"After the death of Hiram, his son Balnazarus succeeded him on the throne, who lived forty-three years, and reigned seven. Next to him his son Abdastartus, who lived twenty-nine years, and reigned nine. He was murdered by the four sons of his nurse, the eldest of whom reigned twelve years. Then Astartus, the son of Deleastartus, who lived fifty-four years, and reigned twelve. Next, his brother Aserymus, who lived fifty-four years, and reigned nine. He was slain by his brother Phelates, who then ascended the throne. He lived fifty years, and reigned only eight months. Ithobalus, a priest of Astarte, put him to death and assumed the sceptre. He lived sixty-eight years, and reigned thirty-two. His successor was his son Badezorus, who lived forty-five years, and reigned six. His son and successor Margenus lived thirty-two years, and reigned nine. Pygmalion succeeded him, who lived fifty-six years, and reigned forty-seven. In the seventh year of his reign Dido fled, and built Carthage in Libya."

HOSEA, supposed by some to be the most ancient of the twelve Minor Prophets, though in order of time he was preceded by Jonah, and perhaps Amos, is placed first in our arrangement of the Prophetical Canon, probably because his Book is the largest of those which contain prophecies delivered before the Captivity, and indeed the largest of all the Twelve, with the single exception of Zechariah. At the commencement of the Book we are informed that "the word of the Lord came unto Hosea, the son of Beer, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam [II.], the son of Joash, king of Israel." From this statement he was nearly contemporary with Isaiah, Amos, and Jonah, and he continued to prophesy about seventy years. That he commenced his prophetic life

early in the long reign of Uzziah is evident from the mention of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, for that king died in the fifteenth year of Uzziah, after a reign of forty-seven years, and from that event to the beginning of Hezekiah's reign, in whose time also Hosea prophesied, was about seventy years.

Nothing is known of the history of this Prophet. As his predictions are chiefly directed against the abominations of the Ten Tribes forming the kingdom of Israel, it is probable that he was a native of and resided in that kingdom. Some Jewish commentators allege that he was of the tribe of Reuben, by confounding his father Beer with Beerah, a prince of that tribe who was carried into captivity by Tiglath-pileser; and others allege that he was of the tribe of Issachar; but there is no authority for either of these conjectures. Bishop Lowth observes of Hosea, that "his style exhibits the appearance of very remote antiquity, and is pointed, energetic, and concise. It bears a distinguished mark of poetical composition, in that pristine brevity and condensation which are observable in the sentences, and which later writers have in some measure neglected. This peculiarity has not escaped the observation of Jerome. 'He is altogether,' says he, speaking of this Prophet, 'laconic and sententious.' But this very circumstance, which was anciently supposed, without doubt, to impart uncommon force and elegance in the present ruinous state of Hebrew literature, is productive of so much obscurity, that although the general subject of this writer be sufficiently obvious, he is the most difficult and perplexed of all the Prophets. Besides, the duration of his ministry must include a very considerable space of time, but we have now only a small volume of his remaining, which, it seems, contains his principal prophecies, and these are extant in a continued series, with no marks of distinction as to the time in which they were published, or the subject of which they treat. We need therefore not be surprised if, in perusing the prophecies

of Hosea, we sometimes find ourselves in a similar predicament with those who consulted the scattered leaves of the Sibyl."

The learned and acute Bishop Horsley, who has investigated the Prophecy of Hosea in his usual masterly manner, thinks it a mistaken notion to suppose that his prophecies are almost wholly against the kingdom of Israel, or that the captivity of the Ten Tribes is the immediate and principal subject. He conceives that Hosea's great subject is rather that which is set forth by all the Prophets—the guilt of the Jewish nation in general, their notoriously disobedient and refractory spirit, the heavy judgments that awaited them, and their final restoration to God's favour in the latter ages of the world. "He confines himself," says the Bishop, "more closely to this single subject than any other Prophet. Comparatively he seems to care little about other people. He wanders not, like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, into the collateral history of surrounding heathen nations; he meddles not, like Daniel, with the revolutions of the great empires of the world; his own country seems to engross his whole attention—her privileges, her crimes, her punishment, her pardon. He predicts, indeed, in the strongest and the clearest terms, the engrafting of the Gentiles into the Church of God, but he mentions it only generally; he enters not, like Isaiah, into a minute detail of the progress of the business. He alludes to the calling of our Lord from Egypt, and to his resurrection on the third day, and he celebrates, in the loftiest strains of triumph and exultation, the Saviour's final victory over death and hell. But yet, of all the Prophets, he certainly enters the least into the detail of the mysteries of redemption. We have nothing in him descriptive of the events of the interval between the two advents of our Lord—nothing diffuse and circumstantial upon the great and interesting mysteries of the Incarnation and the Atonement. His country and kindred are the subjects next his heart. Their crimes excite his indignation, their

sufferings interest his pity, their future exaltation is the object on which his imagination fixes with delight. It is a remarkable dispensation of Providence that clear notices, though in general terms, of the universal redemption should be found in a writer so strongly possessed with national partialities. This Judaism, if I may so call it, seems to make the particular character of Hosea as a prophet. Not that the Ten Tribes are exclusively his subject. His country is indeed his particular and constant subject, but his country generally, in both its branches, not in either, taken by itself."

HOSHEA, or HOSEA, a king of Israel who succeeded Pekah, whom he put to death. As Pekah was murdered in the third or fourth year of the reign of Ahaz, king of Judah, and as Hoshea did not ascend the throne of the Ten Tribes till the twelfth year of the same reign, there must have been an interregnum in that kingdom nearly nine years. Hoshea was the last king of the Ten Tribes. He was in some respects a better ruler than most of his predecessors, for though he "did evil in the sight of the Lord," it was "not as the kings of Israel that were before him." His kingdom was too much weakened to withstand the Assyrian power, and when Shalmanezzer invaded him he was obliged to become tributary. He soon afterwards attempted to shake off the yoke, by forming an alliance with So, king of Egypt; and he imprisoned the Assyrian officer appointed to collect the tribute. This conduct roused the indignation of Shalmanezzer, who invested Samaria, and after a siege of three years gained possession of that city and destroyed it. During all this time the king of Egypt made no attempt to assist the king of Israel, as Isaiah had declared from the first, in language strongly reproving the alliance, Isa. xxx. 1-7. The principal inhabitants of the ten cantonnments were carried captives to Halah, to the river Habor, to Gozan on the eastern side of the Tigris, and to the cities of the Medes; while colonists from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava,

Hamath, and Sepharvaim, were settled in Samaria. These people intermarried with the Hebrews who were permitted to remain in the country, and were latterly all comprehended under the general name of Samaritans, which was derived from the city of Samaria. At first the whole of them were idolaters, but as wild animals increased in their depopulated country they were disturbed by lions, and some of them were killed. In their alarm they viewed this calamity as a just punishment from God for their neglect of his worship, and an Israelitish priest was recalled from exile to instruct them in the knowledge of Jehovah. He settled at Bethel, where one of the golden calves had formerly stood, and the Samaritans afterwards united the worship of the true God with their own idolatrous rites. Nothing is known of Hoshea after the Captivity as it respects either his life, his treatment, or his death. His reign extended to nine years.

HUR. See MOSES.

HUSHAI. See ABSALON and DAVID.

HYMENEUS, a person mentioned by St Paul in his Epistle to Timothy, in connection with Alexander and Philētus, whom he had “delivered over to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme.”

It appears that they denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, affirming that it had “past already,” and they “overthrew the faith of some.” They contended that the only resurrection promised by Christ was a spiritual resurrection from ignorance and error by believing the Gospel, and that no other could be expected. This opinion was probably grounded by the Judaizing teachers on a misapplication of our Saviour’s language (John v. 24, 25), where a spiritual resurrection is certainly intimated; but they overlooked the other parts of his discourse, in which the resurrection of the body is explicitly asserted. “They might be the more easily mistaken on this account,” says Archbishop Secker, “that the Apostles, imitating the language already in use concerning the Jewish proselytes, expressed the changes which Christianity made in the tempers and condition of men by the phrases of *dying to sin*, being *buried with Christ in baptism*, and *rising again to newness of life*. The ignorant or prejudiced might hastily conclude that no other rising again was intended to be taught, and that therefore *the resurrection was past already*, as we are told by the Apostle that some affirmed.”

ISAAC, the only son of Abraham by Sarah, was born at Gerar when his father was in the hundredth year of his age and his mother in her ninetieth, and, according to the Hebrew chronology, B.C. 1897. He was the son of the promise made to his illustrious father, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, and he has always been considered an eminent type of our Saviour. His birth was almost as miraculous as that of Christ. When he arrived at manhood, he disputed not his father’s will, though it was to cost him his life; and in like manner our Saviour became obedient even to the death. Isaac carried the wood on which he was to be

sacrificed, and Christ bore the cross on which he was to be crucified. It is alleged by some that Isaac was carried to the very same place where the Temple afterwards stood, Mount Moriah—a remarkable coincidence, connecting in various instances the Old and New Testaments, the Law and the Gospel, with each other.

The inspired historian gives no particulars of Isaac’s youth. We are simply told “that the child grew, and was weaned; and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned”—probably when he was two or three years old, in conformity with the Oriental custom. As he approached to manhood,

the conduct of Ishmael towards him rendered a separation necessary, and the latter was expatriated from the paternal roof with his mother Hagar by the Divine command. The next transaction of any importance is the remarkable proof which Abraham gave of his faith and obedience by readily preparing to sacrifice Isaac, although he was the son by whom God had solemnly promised signal blessings and a numerous posterity. After the death of Sarah, when Abraham was "old, and well stricken in age," he sent his steward, Eliezer of Damascus, to the country of his ancestors, and to Haran, where Nahor resided, to select a wife for Isaac from his own kindred. The circumstances of the expedition, the first interview with Rebekah, and the return to Abraham's residence, are minutely narrated by the sacred writer. When the caravan appeared in sight of Abraham's tents, Isaac was meditating in the fields at the "eventide," and "he lifted up his eyes, and saw, and, behold, the camels were coming." Rebekah, who had recognised him at a distance, and suspected from his appearance that he was her intended husband, inquired who he was, and ascertained that her conjecture was rightly founded. She in consequence "lighted off the camel," and "took a veil, and covered herself." Isaac, it is to be observed, was walking, and it would therefore have been the highest breach of Oriental manners to have remained on the camel when presented to him. It is likely that they all alighted, and walked to meet him, conducting Rebekah as a bride to meet the bridegroom. Whether veiled before or not, she now *covered herself*, namely, her whole person, with the ample enveloping veil with which brides are still conducted to their bridegrooms in Oriental countries, and which is the indispensable costume for the occasion.

Abraham's steward informed Isaac of all his transactions in this expedition, and he "brought her into his mother Sarah's tent, and took Rebekah, and she became his wife; and he loved her: and Isaac

was comforted after his mother's death." The expression, *he loved her*, has a peculiar and emphatic force which deserves notice. Isaac appears to have been the only one of the Patriarchs who had no opportunity of exhibiting a preference to his wife before marriage. He had never seen Rebekah till she stood before him unveiled in his tent as his wife, and the inspired historian thought it necessary to add that *he loved her* when he did see her. At the present time, what merely arose from circumstances in the case of Isaac is the established practice of the East; for as the women are completely secluded, and never seen without veils, no opportunity of a personal acquaintance before marriage is afforded. The only idea a bridegroom can form of the person and qualifications of his intended wife is taken from the often exaggerated praises of an old nurse, who is generally his agent on those occasions, and the lady is seen by her husband for the first time when he enters the room into which she was received on her arrival at his house.

Isaac at his father's death succeeded to the patriarchal property, which, being chiefly pastoral, was very extensive and valuable. He was forty years old when he married Rebekah, and in the sixtieth year of his age his twin sons Esau and Jacob were born. About B.C. 1804, according to the Hebrew chronology, a famine prevailed throughout the country, and the Patriarch was compelled to remove to Gerar. The king of this Philistine district was Abimelech—the regal designation of those kings, and either the son or the grandson of that Abimelech who reigned during the time of Abraham, when he was driven into the country by a similar necessity. There is a remarkable similarity between the history of Abraham's sojourn at Gerar and that of his son. The beauty of Rebekah had attracted the notice of the inhabitants, and when Isaac was questioned about his relationship to her, he pretended that she was his sister. Their real relationship, however, was accidentally discovered by

Abimelech himself, who sent for Isaac, and reproved him for not stating at once that she was his wife. He also issued an order prohibiting any of his people, under the penalty of death, to offer any insult or molestation to the Patriarch or to Rebekah.

Isaac greatly prospered during his residence at Gerar—"the Lord blessed him, and the man waxed great, and went forward, and grew until he became very great; for he had possession of herds, and great store of servants." His prosperity excited the envy of the Philistines, who stopped the wells which Abraham's servants had sunk, and filled them with earth—a mode of taking vengeance on those who are disagreeable to them, or whom they would prevent from coming or continuing among them, still practised in Oriental countries. Even Abimelech sent a message to him to depart, alleging that he was mightier than himself. Isaac pitched his tents in the valley of Gerar, and commenced to open the wells sunk by his father, which the Philistines had filled up, and "called their names after the names by which his father had called them." Here occurred one of those disputes respecting water between Isaac's servants and the subjects of Abimelech, of which we have many intimations in the Scriptures on several occasions. We are told that "the herdsmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac's herdsmen, saying, The water is ours; and he called the name of the well Esek, because they strove with him. And they digged another well, and strove for that also, and he called the name of it Sitnah." The names given to both wells are highly characteristic, that of Esek signifying *contention*, and that of Sitnah denoting *hatred*. The cause of these differences was the question whether wells dug by Abraham's and Isaac's servants within the territories of Gerar were to be considered the property of those who digged them, or of those who possessed the territorial right to the country. The real object of the people of Gerar in stopping and filling up the wells made by Abra-

ham, was evidently to discourage the visits of such powerful persons to their territory, for otherwise they would have suffered the wells to remain for their own uses. The stopping of Abraham's wells by the Philistines, the re-opening of them by Isaac, the restoration of the former names, and the contention about the rightful possession of them, are all circumstances remarkably characteristic of those Oriental countries in all ages, from the earliest to the present times, where the want of rivers and brooks during the summer, beneath an unclouded sky, a burning sun, and often amidst arid and sandy deserts, renders the tribes dependent upon the wells for the existence of their flocks and herds, which form their wealth. From the great depth of earth which must be dug away to obtain water, we may infer the degree of labour employed to get at wells filled up by the Philistines, which Isaac had to re-open. It is probable that the wells successively sunk by Isaac did not furnish a sufficient supply of water for his own flocks and those of the Philistines of Gerar, and the question would consequently become one of exclusive right.

Such disputes as those we are now considering often lead to bitter and bloody quarrels in the East, and, perhaps to avoid a more fatal contention, Isaac withdrew from the more settled part of the country towards the desert, though it appears that the Philistines did not again stop the wells while he was in their country. He "removed from thence, and digged another well, and for that they strove not, and he called the name of it Rehoboth, and he said, For now the Lord hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land." He soon afterwards proceeded to Beersheba, and here Jehovah appeared unto him, declaring—"I am the God of Abraham thy father; fear not, for I am with thee, and will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake." Here he was also visited by Abimelech, who, in reply to his charge that he was hated by the Philistines, informed him of the

purport of his visit. "We saw certainly," said the king, "that the Lord was with thee, and we said, Let there now be an oath betwixt us, even betwixt us and thee, and let us make a covenant with thee, that thou wilt do us no hurt, as we have not touched thee, and as we have done unto thee nothing but good, and have sent thee away in peace; thou art now the blessed of the Lord." Isaac received them with hospitality, and entered into the covenant they desired. Shortly after this his son Esau married Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Basemath, the daughter of Elon the Hittite, "which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah."

Isaac had always manifested a particular partiality to Esau, while Jacob on the other hand was Rebekah's favourite. In his old age his eyes became dim, and he resolved to bestow his paternal blessing on his two sons before his death. Preparatory to this he ordered Esau to go out to the field and procure him some venison, of which he was to "make savoury meat—such," he said, "as I love, and bring it to me that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die." The order was overheard by Rebekah, who resolved that her favourite Jacob should supplant Esau in the blessing. The account of this extraordinary deception practised upon the venerable Patriarch, and its consequences, is given in another place (see Esau). The enraged Esau vowed revenge, but delayed inflicting it till after the death of his father. Jacob was sent to Laban, Rebekah's brother in Haran, to escape Esau's resentment, and his history during that period of probation is given in another place. He returned to Isaac after his interview with Esau, bringing with him his wives and his children, and resided with him at Arba, afterwards called Hebron. Here Isaac died, and "was gathered unto his people, being old and full of days," and he was buried by his sons Jacob and Esau in the sepulchre purchased by Abraham at Machpelah.

Isaac is always mentioned with the

greatest veneration by the inspired writers of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, but there are few transactions of remarkable importance in his own personal history. He was permitted to see a considerable increase of his posterity before his death, and to be a witness of the gradual fulfilment of the magnificent promises made to his father Abraham, and confirmed to himself. He died in the one hundred and eightieth year of his age.

ISAIAH, or ESAIAS, a distinguished Jewish Prophet, of the tribe of Judah, is supposed to have been of royal descent, and his father Amos to have been a brother of Azariah, or Uziah, king of Judah. His first appointment to the prophetic office is supposed to have taken place in the last year of Uziah's reign, and if he lived to the reign of Manasseh, B.C. 696, by whose order, according to a tradition of the Jews, he was sawn asunder, the duration of his office must have extended to nearly sixty-two years. The Rabbi Ben Ezra thinks that Isaiah died before Hezekiah—an opinion now generally received, which reduces the term of his prophetic office to about forty-eight years. We know that he at least lived to the fifteenth or sixteenth year of that prince's reign, so that he prophesied under four sovereigns—Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 37) is supposed to make an allusion to his death. The account which makes Isaiah of the royal race of David rests on no foundation which the Scripture offers, and his father Amos must not be confounded with the Prophet of that name.

Bishop Lowth appropriately designates Isaiah the *prince of prophets*, and ranks him with Homer; the Jewish writers call him the *great prophet*; Eusebius distinguishes him as the *greatest of the Prophets*; and Jerome calls him an *evangelist*, because his predictions are so distinct, that he seems to speak rather of things past than to come. This Father also calls him an *Apostle*, and the title *Evangelical Prophet* is now generally associated with his name. Grotius desig-

nates him the Demosthenes of the Hebrews. The sublimity of Isaiah's prophecies, both in their style and objects, has always directed the attention of Jews and Christians more strongly to this Book than perhaps to any other in the prophetic canon of the Old Testament. It is more frequently quoted in the New Testament than any other, with the exception of the Psalms; and the predictions of Isaiah concerning the advent and character, ministry, sufferings, and death of the Messiah, and the permanence of the Messiah's universal kingdom, are so explicit and determinate, as well as so numerous, that no one can be at a loss in applying them to the mission and personal appearance of our Saviour, and to those events of his history recorded by the Evangelists. On these most important accounts the Prophecy of Isaiah has always been eminently successful in the conviction of the unbelieving, the confirmation of the doubtful, and the consolation of the pious. The whole Book, with the exception of some passages, which in all would not exceed five or perhaps six chapters, is considered by Bishop Lowth as highly poetical. "He abounds," says this elegant critic and translator, "in such transcendent excellencies, that he may be properly said to afford the most perfect model of the Prophetic poetry. He is at once elegant and sublime, forcible and ornamented: he unites energy with copiousness, and dignity with variety. In his sentiments there are uncommon elevation and majesty: in his imagery the utmost propriety, elegance, dignity, and diversity: in his language unrivalled beauty and energy: and, notwithstanding the obscurity of his subjects, a surprising degree of clearness and simplicity. To these we may add, there is such sweetness in the poetical composition of his sentences, whether it proceed from art or genius, that if the Hebrew poetry at present is possessed of any of its native grace and harmony, we shall find these in the writings of Isaiah. He greatly excels, too, in all the graces of method, order, connection, and arrange-

ment; though in asserting this we must not forget the nature of the prophetic impulse, which bears always the mind with irresistible violence, and frequently in rapid transitions from near to remote objects—from human to divine. We must also be careful in remarking the limits of particular predictions, since, as they are now extant, they are often improperly connected, without any marks of discrimination, which injudicious arrangement on some occasions creates almost insuperable difficulties." Bishop Lowth considers that the latter part of the Book, commencing at the fortieth chapter, "is perhaps the most elegant specimen remaining of inspired history, and yet in this respect is attended with considerable difficulty. It is, in fact, a body or collection of different prophecies nearly allied to each other as to the subject, which, for that reason, having a sort of connection, are not to be separated but with the utmost difficulty. The general subject is the restoration of the Church. Its deliverance from captivity, the destruction of idolatry, the vindication of the divine power and truth, the consolation of the Israelites, the divine invitation which is extended to them, their incredulity, impiety, and rejection, the calling in of the Gentiles, the restoration of the chosen people, the glory and felicity of the Church in its perfect state, and the ultimate destination of the wicked, are all set forth with a sufficient respect to order and method. If we read these passages with attention, and duly regard the nature and genius of the mystical allegory, at the same time remembering that all these points have been frequently touched upon in other prophecies promulgated at different times, we shall neither find any irregularity in the arrangement of the whole, nor any want of order and connection as to matter or sentiment in the different parts."

The time of the delivery of some of Isaiah's prophecies is either expressly marked in, or easily deducible from, the history to which they relate; and that of a few others may be inferred from

expressions, descriptions, and circumstances combined in the prophecies themselves. Some of them, however, as Bishop Lowth observes, are obscure, as that contained in the eighteenth chapter, where the end and design of the prediction, the people to whom it is addressed, the person who sends the messengers, and the nation to whom the messengers are sent, are at least doubtful. It is to be regretted that so little is known of the personal history of this distinguished Prophet. The son of Sirach, in his fine and discriminating encomium on the Prophets, says of Isaiah that he was "great and faithful in his vision," and that "his ministry" delivered the inhabitants of Jerusalem from Sennacherib, and his general Rabshakeh, who had "lifted up his hand against Sion, and boasted proudly." We are farther told that in the time of Isaiah "the sun went backwards, and he lengthened the king's life. He saw by an excellent spirit what should come to pass at the last, and he comforted them that mourned in Sion. He showed what things should come to pass for ever, and secret things or ever they came." It is certain that Isaiah, in addition to his other prophetic privileges, was invested on some particular occasions with the power of performing miracles, 2 Kings xx. 11. He designates his wife, whose name is not given, a prophetess, and the Rabbins maintain that she also had the gift of prophecy. His sons were for types and figurative pledges of God's assurances, and their names and actions were intended to awaken a religious attention in the persons whom they were commissioned to address and instruct. "Behold," he says, "I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Sion." In this passage, moreover, as appears from the marginal reference, Heb. xi. 13, Isaiah speaks in the person of Christ as well as his own.

Although the Book of Isaiah is placed first in order in the Prophetic Canon, as he was actually the first of the greater

Prophets, his predecessors were Jonah, Amos, and Hosea. To attempt any thing like a proper analysis of his valuable memorial of inspired antiquity would far exceed the limits of the present article, and the various works of the authors who have devoted their learning, their talents, and their critical judgment, in different translations and illustrations, are accessible to every reader. The comprehensive and judicious summary of Bishop Tomline forms an excellent substitute for more lengthened details. "Though Isaiah gives so copious and circumstantial an account of the promised Messiah and his kingdom, that he has been emphatically styled the *Evangelical Prophet*, his Book is not confined to prophecies relative to our Saviour; it contains many other predictions, and likewise several historical relations. It may be considered under six general divisions. The *first* division consists of the first five chapters, containing a general description of the state and condition of the Jews in the several periods of their history, the promulgation of the Gospel, and the coming of Christ to judgment. The *second* division consists of the seven next chapters, containing in the seventh the promise to Ahaz, which was predictive of Christ, whose nature, birth, and kingdom, are distinctly described in the ninth chapter; the denunciations of punishment upon the Assyrians in the tenth chapter seems an interruption to this glorious subject, which is resumed in the eleventh, where the Prophet breaks out into a hymn of praise, celebrating the future triumphant state of the Church. The *third* division, which reaches from the thirteenth to the twenty-second chapter inclusive, begins with a very remarkable prophecy of the destruction of Babylon, which is considered as a type of Antichrist; it then describes the fate of the Jews, Assyrians, Moabites, Philistines, Arabians, Syrians, and Egyptians, and concludes in a manner similar to the last. The *fourth* division, which extends from the twenty-eighth to the thirty-fifth inclusive, con-

tains predictions relative to the then approaching invasion of Sennacherib, but it is interspersed with severe reproofs and threats against the Jews for disobedience and wilful blindness, and also with consolatory promises to those who should remain faithful in the service of God, alluding frequently to the times of the Gospel. The thirty-sixth and two following chapters, which constitute the *fifth* division, give an historical account of the invasion of Sennacherib, and of the prolongation of Hezekiah's life. The *sixth* division reaches from the thirty-ninth chapter to the end of the Book. Here the Prophet generally addresses his countrymen as being actually in the captivity, which he had previously foretold;—he predicts the total destruction of the empire of Babylon, and the restoration of the Jews to their own land by their great deliverer Cyrus, whom he represents the Almighty as calling upon by name to execute his will about two hundred years before he was born. In this latter part of the Book are principally contained the numerous prophecies already noticed, concerning the birth, ministry, death, and religion of Christ, together with a variety of circumstances which were to precede and follow his incarnation."

ISH-BOSHETH, a younger son of Saul, whom Abner proclaimed king of Israel after the death of his father, in opposition to David. Dr Chandler observes, that if Abner had acted on principles of justice, and as a faithful friend to the succession of Saul's house, he would have advanced to the crown not Ish-bosheth, but Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, to whom, if the crown was to descend by hereditary right, it certainly belonged. Ish-bosheth was proclaimed king of Israel at Mahanaim, a place in the tribe of Gad, so called from the appearance of angels to Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 1, 2. All the tribes on the western side of the Jordan appear to have acknowledged Ish-bosheth, except the tribe of Judah, who had proclaimed David; and Abner's reason for retreating to Mahanaim seems to have been to secure the

people on that side of the Jordan, who were generally attached to Saul's family—to prevent the Philistines from falling on the king whom he had under his protection—and to be at a greater distance from David. Ish-bosheth was in his fortieth year when he was advanced to the disputed throne, and reigned two years. A kind of civil war ensued between the supporters of Saul's family and of David. Abner came with an army to force the tribe of Judah to obedience, but after the first victory of Joab, the general of David, he never again took the field, and David was far from wishing to continue the civil strife. After supporting Ish-bosheth two years, a quarrel took place between him and Abner, who made arrangements for bringing the eleven tribes over to David, but before he could accomplish this desirable purpose, which was the only way to secure peace, he was treacherously assassinated by Joab. Ish-bosheth was shortly afterwards murdered, while sleeping at mid-day, by two generals of his own tribe of Benjamin, named Rechab and Baanah. They brought the head of the unfortunate prince to David, expecting to be rewarded for cutting off such a powerful rival, but he ordered them to be ignominiously put to death, and deposited the head of Ish-bosheth in the sepulchre of Abner at Hebron. The Hebrew chronology assigns, as the date of this transaction, the year B.C. 1048.

ISHMAEL, the ancestor of the Ishmaelites, was the son of Abraham by Hagar, an Egyptian *bondmaid*, or slave, belonging to his wife Sarah. While yet pregnant, Hagar, who appears to have reproached her mistress for her barrenness—one of the greatest insults which can possibly be offered to Oriental wives—was so harshly used in consequence by the indignant Sarah, that she fled from the Patriarch's residence, and from the direction she took into the Wilderness of Shur, which borders on Egypt, she was evidently endeavouring to return to her own country. In this desolate track, disconsolate and dishcartened, she was

visited by the "angel of the Lord"—the first time we read of the appearance of an angel, and some, without any authority, conjecture this heavenly messenger to indicate the Eternal Word, or Second Person of the Trinity. She was exhorted to return to her mistress, and submit herself to her authority. The angel informed her—"Thou shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael, because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man: his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him, and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." Hagar was sitting beside a well in the desert when she received this Divine announcement, and she expressed her gratitude by devout exclamations—"Thou God seest me, for she said, Have I also here looked after him that seeth me?" The well was called *Beer-lahai-roi*, which means, *the well of Him that liveth and seeth me*.

The angel said to Hagar—"Thou shalt call his name Ishmael." This is the first instance in the Scriptures of a name being given by Divine direction before birth. Like all other Hebrew names it was significant, and referred to some characteristic circumstance or quality of mind and person. Ishmael is derived from the Hebrew *shamah*, *to hear*, and *el*, *God*, and denotes, *The Lord hath hearkened*. Hagar followed the directions of the angel, and returned to her mistress. In due time Ishmael was born, and named as the angel had intimated, when his father Abraham was in his eighty-sixth year. Four years after the birth of Ishmael, Jehovah was pleased to renew his covenant with Abraham, when his name was significantly changed from Abram, because he was to be a "father of many nations." The birth of a son by Sarah, whose name was also changed from Sarai, was distinctly announced to him. This completely satisfied him that Ishmael was not to be the son of the promise, and afraid that he might be cast out and neglected, he addressed the emphatic prayer—"O that

Ishmael might live before thee." The covenant was again renewed, and Isaac was announced by name:—"And as for Ishmael," said Jehovah, "I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation."

When the command of circumcision was given to Abraham, Ishmael was thirteen years old. It is well known that the eighth day is the time of circumcision among the Jews, but the Arab descendants of Ishmael, among whom the observance of the rite was made obligatory by Mahomet, usually postpone it till the age of thirteen. Nothing more is recorded of Ishmael till the time of his expulsion from his father's household with his mother Hagar, some years after the birth of Isaac, and when the future father of the Arab tribes could not have been less than sixteen or seventeen years old. The inspired historian informs us that "Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking, wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son, for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." It is not very clear what the *mockery* here denotes. The Hebrew word implies *jesting* or *playing*, and St Paul, in the well known allusion to this circumstance in the Epistle to the Galatians, says that Ishmael *persecuted* or *teased* Isaac. It is evident that Sarah had little confidence in the promise of a son made to Abraham, and probably before the birth of Isaac she treated him as the sole hope of Abraham's family, and almost as her own son. But the birth of Isaac made a complete change in Ishmael's condition, who, when he was grown up, would be naturally mortified at being superseded by Isaac, whom he considered his younger brother, and whom he appears not to have treated with the consideration and respect which Sarah required. The Patriarch heard the proposal with great reluct-

ance, and it appeared "very grievous in his sight because of his son." A Divine communication, however, satisfied him of the propriety of the suggestion, and that it had not proceeded from Sarah merely in anger. He was informed—"Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of the bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice, for in Isaac shall thy seed be called [namely, that the Messiah was not to descend from Ishmael but from Isaac]. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed." Abraham no longer hesitated about the expatriation of Ishmael and his mother. He "took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and sent her away; and she departed, and wandered in the Wilderness of Beer-sheba."

The *bottle* here mentioned was probably a kid-skin slung across her back from her shoulder. Earthen or wooden vessels would soon be broken in Oriental journeys, and no one ever thinks of personally carrying such vessels containing water in a journey across the desert. The *bread* noticed included all sort of provision for their present necessity, until they came to the place to which in all probability they were directed by Abraham, while the heat of the climate, and the scarcity of streams and wells, rendered it indispensable to carry water with them, as it still is in those regions. "It is," says Stackhouse, "from our inattention to the customs of the times, if we imagine that Hagar and Ishmael had any hard usage in their ejection. Whatever the nature of their offence may have been, there is no reason to accuse Abraham's conduct, since it was pursuant to a Divine direction—was agreeable to the practice of the times, and no more than what other fathers in those days imposed upon their younger sons—since the hardships which Hagar and Ishmael suffered were accidental, but the benefits which accrued were designed—since Abraham by this means rescued them from a state

of servitude for ever, and, according to the Divine prediction, was persuaded that this would be the only expedient to make of Ishmael a flourishing nation."

Hagar wandered about in the desert with Ishmael until their water was consumed, when they were in the most trying condition in which human beings can possibly be placed. The extreme heat of those arid regions greatly increases the ordinary demands of nature to drink, and the exhaustion of the water, without a prospect of a fresh supply, reduces the traveller to a condition of utter misery and danger. Ishmael, though a young man, less inured to the toils and trials of the desert than his mother, began to fail sooner, and needed her assistance; but when the usual symptoms came upon him—his eyes painfully affected, his parched lips and tongue swollen, his brain becoming thick and inflamed, and when he was deafened by the hollow sounds in his ears—he could proceed no farther, and his distracted mother laid him under the shade of a tree or shrub, under which he doubtless expressed a wish to lie down and die. Her maternal feelings overcame her own sufferings and distresses, and she retired to some distance to avoid the pain of seeing her son die, and "sat over against him, and lift up her voice, and wept." But the unrestrained wailings and lamentations of this solitary female were not unnoticed by Him who restoreth the feeble, filleth the hungry with good things, and whose kind and beneficent Providence is ever in active operation. A mysterious voice comforted her in her afflictions, and enjoined her to lift up Ishmael, and hold him or support him under his extreme weakness. A well was discovered to her, from which she filled the kid-skin bottle, and she was thus enabled to restore her exhausted son—the promise being at the same time renewed to her that God would make him a great nation.

The inspired historian informs us, that "God was with the lad, and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer." He supported himself in

those wild and uninhabited regions in the same manner as most of his descendants, who never set their hands to the plough, but obtained food to supply their necessities by their bow, living on wild flesh and venison, and such wild fowl as the desert afforded, with herbs and milk. He afterwards removed to another part of the great Desert, called the Desert of Paran, which still retains its ancient name, extending southward from Palestine into the peninsula of Sinai. In process of time his mother procured a wife for him from her own country of Egypt, by whom he had twelve sons, who established themselves as the heads of so many distinct tribes—the *twelve princes* intimated by Jehovah to Abraham, and his descendants are mentioned in history under the general names of Arabs and Ishmaelites. Of Ishmael's personal history, as far as noticed in the Scriptures, we merely learn that he joined with his brother Isaac in paying the last tribute of respect to the remains of their father, and that he himself died at the age of one hundred and thirty-seven years.

Moses informs us that the descendants of Ishmael spread themselves from "Havilah to Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest into Assyria," from which we may easily infer that they spread themselves on both sides so far as to have taken possession of the greatest part of Arabia; and Josephus styles their progenitor the founder of the Arabian nation. The names of the *twelve princes*, the sons of Ishmael, are given, and the whole statement concerning them is obviously intended to point them out as the ancestors of great Arabian tribes. Arabia, however, was peopled to a certain extent before the time of Ishmael by an aboriginal race, whom the Arabian historians, for the Scriptures are silent on the subject, describe as descended from Kahtan, or Joktan, the son of Heber, whose other son Peleg was an ancestor of Abraham. This Joktan is called pre-eminently the *Father of the Arabs*, and his descendants the Kahtan tribe—the wealthiest tribe of the eastern desert of Arabia, constitute

with the Beeri Saad tribe, according to the Arabian historians, the only remains of the primitive inhabitants of the country. A member of these tribes is called *an Arab al Araba*, or *an Arab of the Arabs*—a distinction of purity of descent corresponding to the *Hebrew of the Hebrews*. The prevailing race of *Most-Arabi*, or *mixed and naturalized Arabs*, are descended from Ishmael and a daughter of Modad, king of Hedjaz, whom he married, either during the lifetime of his first wife, who was an Egyptian woman, or after her death. Ishmael became, we are told, the prince of Hedjaz, and taught the true religion of Abraham to the idolatrous aborigines, many of whose tribes were subsequently extirpated either by dissensions among themselves or by the swords of the Ishmaelites. Nevertheless, no Arabian considers it any dishonour to belong to the tribes of the mixed Arabs, for the want of the pure descent is amply compensated in his opinion by being descended from Abraham, whom all the Arabs hold in as great veneration as do the Jews.

It was said of Ishmael that he was to be a *wild man*, and there are no people to whom that distinguishing characteristic can be applied with more propriety than to the Arabs, whether in reference to their personal appearance, their modes of life, or their abodes, which latter is the inhospitable desert, offering no charms to any other eyes but theirs, yet to them the more attractive, because it secures to them that independence and liberty which constitute the charm of their existence. It was also said of Ishmael that *his hand would be against every man, and every man's hand against him*—a description equally applicable to his descendants, for there are perhaps no people whom it describes with greater truth—aggression on all the world having been a condition, as it were, of their existence. Plunder is their principal occupation, and they are besides continually at variance amongst themselves. We are assured by Burckhardt that there are few tribes ever in a state of perfect peace with all their neigh-

hours, and that he could not recollect this to be the case with any one among the numerous tribes with which he was acquainted. In contemplating the descendants of Ishmael at the present time, we are carried back at once to the days of their progenitor, and of the earliest Patriarchs. Their language, possessions, food, dress, tents, and ceremonies, are still the same. At their wells they water their flocks; they sit at the door of the tent in the cool of the day; they hate the minute boundaries and demarcations of settled districts; the restraints and limitations of cities and towns are odious in their sight; they move onwards from place to place near or distant, and pitch their tents near richer pasturage; and the treasures they possess are the same as those in the Patriarchal times—camels, kine, sheep, and goats, men-servants and women-servants, and changes of raiment. “We may stand near one of their encampments,” says a traveller, “and as the aged men sit in dignity, or the young men and maidens drive past us with their flocks, we are almost ready to ask if such an one be Abraham, or Lot, or Jacob, or Job, or Bildad the Shuhite, or Rebekah, or Rachel, or the daughter of Jethro the Midianite—we seem to know them all. The mountains, and valleys, and streams, partake of the same unchangeableness; not a stone has been removed, not a barrier has been raised, not a tree has been planted, not a village has been collected together. The founder of the race might come to the earth, and he would recognise without an effort his own people and his own land.”

The families of the Arabian deserts are the descendants of Ishmael, and what an astonishing confirmation is this fact, among others, to the truth of the inspired writings? Again let us attend to the description given of this extraordinary people by the angel of God to Hagar before their ancestor was born:—“I will make him a great nation—He will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man’s hand against him.” This has been, and is, literally

fulfilled at the present moment, and though they are not insensible to some of the advantages which have been withheld from them, and think it fair and reasonable that they should obtain by violence a share of the productions of the fertile world, they love the freedom and desolate grandeur of their desert inheritance, and achieve, in their capacity of avowed robbers, acts as daring and chivalrous as would won in the field of battle the admiration of all Europe. The more we examine and are acquainted with their continual wanderings with their flocks and herds, their constant readiness for action, and their frequent predatory excursions against strangers and each other, the more will we be impressed with the characteristic intimation that Ishmael was to be a *wild man*. Perhaps no nation, with the exception of the Hebrews in the times of their ancient splendour, has ever been so great as the Arabs that could trace its origin to one single head. There have been, and there are, empires and kingdoms more extensive, but these were and are composed of many nations of different origin, and their greatness is produced by the combined and concentrated glory of various once distinct but now amalgamated families and tribes. Nations, moreover, once rude, uncivilized, and predatory, have become ameliorated and refined by the dissemination of religion and knowledge; with them the ploughshare has supplanted the spear, and the pruning-hook has come in place of the sword: they have blushed for the ignorance of their ancestors, and have been astonished at the annals of their barbarity; and literature, science, and the arts—manufactures, trade, and commerce—the pursuit of every thing noble, useful, and refined, have long progressively distinguished the descendants of those hordes who once roved unrestrained as warlike barbarians, and lived in a state of continual military aggression. But let us look at the sons of Ishmael at this very hour, as they have been for thousands of years. They are still *wild men*—their hand is still against every

man, and of necessity every man's hand is against them. It is no protection to speak the same language, or even to profess the same religion. "The caravan, on its pilgrimage to Mecca," says a recent observer, "is considered to offer as lawful a booty as the bales of the rich merchant, or the stores of the infidel stranger. Of one only among all the streams of population, by which this earth has been covered, was the singular prophecy [respecting Ishmael] uttered, and of only one would it have been true. The surrounding countries of Egypt, Syria, and Persia, have once and again changed their rulers and their race, but Arabia has ever continued the same. The march of conquest has been around her, but has never penetrated her wilds. Still she has retained her identity—an oasis amidst a desert of slaves. That which was true concerning her in the time of Moses has been equally so in every subsequent period of time, and will continue until another prophecy be fulfilled, and even *Arabia's desert ranges* shall bow before the power that is supreme. Then the horse shall no longer stand ready caparisoned to pursue and plunder the passing traveller—'Holiness unto the Lord' shall be inscribed upon its bells. Then shall Isaac and Ishmael again meet together in peace, to worship at one altar the God of their fathers, and

Jesus Christ whom He has sent—their hand shall be *with* every man, and every man's hand *with* them."

It is remarkable that the Mahometans to a certain extent reverse the history of Ishmael as noticed in the Scriptures, and make him, and not Isaac, the son of the promise, and the true heir of Abraham. They allege that when Sarah demanded the expulsion of Hagar and her son, Abraham conveyed them to the district of Mecca, then a dry and arid desert, and here God caused a spring of water to arise under the feet of Ishmael. They believe this spring to be the famous well *Zemzem*, within the enclosure of the Temple of Mecca, which supplies water to the inhabitants of that city, and to the numerous pilgrims who resort thither. The Mahometans farther believe that their celebrated *caaba* or temple, called *Brit-Allah*, or *House of God*, was erected by Abraham, assisted by Ishmael, to commemorate the deliverance of the latter from dying of thirst, and from being the victim of the well known sacrifice of which they consider him, instead of Isaac, to have been the party concerned. The Mahometans relate many other traditions of Ishmael and Abraham, which show how facts have been and still are understood and distorted by a people whose history is intimately connected with the Scriptures.

J

JABIN, a king of the northern Canaanites, whose residence was at Hazor near Lake Merom. These Canaanites suffered a total overthrow from Joshua, but had gradually recovered their strength during an interval of one hundred and seventy-eight years, and in the reign of Jabin their power was much greater than before. He greatly oppressed the northern tribes of the Hebrews, and retained in his service a numerous army under the command of his general Sisera, with nine hundred chariots of iron. From such a

multitude of soldiers, the Hebrews suffered every species of tyranny and extortion, in addition to the tribute they were compelled to pay to Jabin. This oppression continued twenty years, or to the one hundred and twenty-eighth after Joshua, when they repented of their idolatry, and were delivered by the agency of the Prophetess Deborah, of the tribe of Ephraim, who roused the courage of Barak of the tribe of Naphtali, and in her capacity of judge she appointed him commander of the Hebrew forces. The

Canaanites were so completely routed that they never recovered from the blow, and a peace of forty years ensued.

JACOB, the third distinguished Patriarch of the future Hebrew nation, the son of Isaac and Rebekah, and twin brother of Esau, was born B.C. 1836. The fierce and turbulent temper, active spirit, and adventurous pursuits of Esau, which secured for him his father's partiality, are finely contrasted with the peaceable disposition, domestic habits, and pastoral occupations of Jacob, who became the favourite of his mother. Jacob, we are told, was a "plain man, dwelling in tents"—a description remarkably characteristic of a chief residing in tents, still found among the Arabs and nomade tribes of Asia. Jacob derived his name from the manner of his birth, as he came into the world holding his brother's heel, and the Hebrew word means *he sup-plant*ed, which forcibly indicated some events which followed. (See Esau.) Having craftily obtained the blessing destined by Isaac for Esau, he was sent by his mother to her brother Laban in Padan-Aram, to avoid the threatened effects of Esau's resentment. Before his departure, he was summoned to attend his father Isaac, who communicated to him his commands respecting his marriage, and again blessed him in the most affectionate manner. "Thou shalt not," said the venerable Patriarch, "take a wife of the daughters of Canaan. Arise, go to Padan-Aram, to the house of Bethuel, thy mother's father, and take thee a wife from thence of the daughters of Laban, thy mother's brother. And God Almighty bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people; and give thee the blessing of Abraham to thee, and to thy seed with thee, that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham."

The region called Padan-Aram to which Jacob travelled, and where he afterwards fed the flocks of Laban many years, skirts the north and north-eastern

parts of Mesopotamia Proper, containing rich pastures and pleasant hills, although the want of water prevents large portions of the soil, which is naturally fertile, from being productive. In his journey from Beersheba Jacob halted to pass the night, and "he took of the stones of the place, and put them for his pillow, and lay down in that place to sleep." This fine intimation of pastoral simplicity introduces us to a singular circumstance. During his sleep he had a vision or dream of a peculiar nature, which heightened his prospects, cheered him in his despondency, and induced him to form pious and laudable resolutions. In this vision he beheld a ladder as it were "set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven, and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of." Jacob awoke, and felt an indescribable awe at the remarkable vision he had seen, and which so fully corroborated the blessing he had obtained from Isaac instead of Esau. "Surely," he exclaimed, "the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not." He became afraid at the sense of the Divine Presence in the lonely and uninhabited country where he then was, and he said, "How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven!" He rose up early in the morning, and in conformity with a custom which is still followed in Oriental countries, and of which we have many intimations in Scripture, he took the stone on which his head reclined, and

set it up as a pillar, pouring oil upon it, and calling it *Beth-el*, or the *House of God*. In the immediate neighbourhood of this spot the city of Beth-el, first called Luz, was built—a place celebrated in the history of Jacob's descendants, and especially after the revolt of the Ten Tribes. He also "vowed a vow," saying, "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then shall the Lord be my God; and this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be God's house, and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee." On this subject Mr Morier remarks—"Nothing is so natural, in a journey over a dreary country (in the East), as for a solitary traveller to set himself down fatigued, and to make the vow that Jacob did—'If God will be with me, and keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat,' &c.; or, again, that on first seeing the place which he has so long toiled to reach, the traveller should sit down and make a thanksgiving, in both cases setting up a stone as a memorial." It may be observed, that the Jews believe that the stone which constituted Jacob's pillow when he saw this remarkable vision was placed in the sanctuary of the second Temple, and that the ark of the covenant rested upon it. They add, that after the destruction of that Temple, and the desolation of their country, their fathers were accustomed to lament their calamities on the same stone. On the other hand, the Mahometans firmly believe that their temple at Mecca is built over it. The old and fabulous tradition that it was carried to Spain, and thence to Scotland, and that it is now in the coronation chair of the sovereigns of the British Empire in Westminster Abbey, is related in all histories of England and Scotland.

It has been observed by commentators that the vow which Jacob made on this occasion is the first of which we read expressly in Scripture, yet he appears to

have done no more than his fathers had done before him, as in the case of Abraham; for when Jehovah made a covenant with him, it must be presumed that the Patriarch on his part expressed his acceptance, and even *vowed* to perform the conditions that he might obtain the benefits. On this incident of Jacob's eventful life Bishop Hall gives some fine practical reflections. "Isaac's life was not more retired and quiet than Jacob's was busy and troublesome. In the one I see the image of contemplation, of action in the other. None of the Patriarchs ever saw so evil days as he—from whom justly hath the church of God therefore taken her name. Neither were the faithful ever since called Abrahamites, but Israelites. As an emblem of his future lot he began his strife in the womb; after that he flies for his life from a cruel brother to a cruel uncle. With a staff goes he over Jordan alone, doubtful and comfortless, not like the son of Isaac. In the way the earth is his bed, and a stone his pillow, yet even there he sees a vision of angels. Jacob's heart was never so full of joy as when his head lay hardest. God is most present with us in our greatest dejection, and loves to give comfort to those who are forsaken of their hopes."

Jacob proceeded on his journey, and "came into the land of the people of the east." We are now introduced to one of the finest pastoral scenes in the sacred writings where such delineations are given. He found himself in an inhabited country, in the very district which he sought. He perceived a well in a field, and three flocks lying near it, "for out of that well they watered the flocks; and a great stone was upon the well's mouth." Sir John Chardin gives us an explanation of the last mentioned circumstance, which is confirmed by subsequent travellers. In Arabia, he tells us, and in other Oriental regions of the Desert, the people are accustomed to cover up their wells of water lest the sand, which is put into motion by the winds like the water of a pond, should fill them, and quite stop them up. On

this occasion the flocks were gathered together, the stone was taken from the mouth of the well, the flocks were watered, and the well carefully closed. Jacob accosted the persons who had the charge of the flocks, and inquired whence they came. They replied that they came from Haran. He then asked if they knew Laban the son of Nahor, and they said, "We know him." He next inquired—"Is he well?" to which they replied, "He is well; and behold Rachel his daughter cometh with the sheep." Jacob then displayed his knowledge of pastoral pursuits—"Lo, it is yet high day, neither is it time that the cattle should be gathered together; water ye the sheep, and go and feed them." They replied—"We cannot, until all the flocks be gathered together; and till they roll the stone from the well's mouth; then we water the sheep."

There is no real discrepancy between this verse and that which occurs before Jacob's conversation with the herdsmen. We have here recited what was customary to be done at this well, and the rest of the narrative describes what was done on this particular occasion, in conformity with the general usage. The whole strikingly indicates the value of a well of water in the East. Chardin informs us that he has known wells or cisterns of water locked up when they were private property; and even when left unlocked, some person is so far the proprietor, that none dare open the well unless in his presence, or of some one belonging to his household. This traveller conjectures with great reason that the present well belonged to Laban's family, and that the assembled herdsmen durst not open the well till his daughter Rachel came with his flocks.

While conversing with the herdsmen Jacob saw Rachel approaching with her father's flocks, "for," says the inspired historian, "*she kept them.*" This employment in those early days was deemed honourable, before pastoral nations settled in towns and adopted the refinements of life, and has been imitated more

or less in all countries. It is indeed no proof of the dignity of the employment in the Patriarchal times to find the daughter of a person of such consequence as Laban keeping her father's flocks, for all drudgery devolves upon females in the East. It is, on the other hand, strongly expressed when we find the *sons* of kings and powerful chiefs similarly employed. The pastoral poetry of classical antiquity celebrates females of birth and attractions acting as shepherdesses long after the practice had been discontinued among persons of their rank; and Forbes mentions, in his *Oriental Memoirs*, that in certain Brahmin villages women of the first distinction draw water from the wells, and tend the cattle to pasture, *like Rebekah and Rachel*. This may result from the well known custom of the women being obliged to perform every servile office, and not from any dignity in the occupation; yet among some Arab tribes it is the exclusive business of the young unmarried women to drive the cattle to pasture. They set out before sunrise, carrying provisions with them, and do not return till the evening. Burckhardt describes these young women as generally civil to strangers, and ready to share with them their provisions and milk. He also says that they are fully able to protect themselves against any depredation or danger, the exercise to which they are inured making them as hardy and vigorous as the men.

Jacob, as soon as Rachel approached with the flock, "went near, and rolled the stone from the well's mouth, and watered the flock of Laban his mother's brother." He is not to be supposed as having broken the standing rule, or as having done any thing out of the ordinary course, for the Oriental shepherds will not submit to the dictation or interference of a stranger, but he rendered a kind service to Rachel, as the watering of cattle is very laborious and fatiguing. He next saluted Rachel, and told her that he was her father's kinsman and the son of Rebekah. She immediately proceeded to her father, and announced to

him the arrival of Jacob. Laban went out to meet him, and gave him a most hospitable reception, being made acquainted with the reasons for his retirement from his father Isaac's residence, the Providence of God which he had experienced during his journey, and his happy meeting with Rachel. His uncle listened to him with attention, and expressed towards him the greatest affection. "Surely," he said, "thou art my bone and my flesh."

After Jacob had remained a month with Laban, the latter proposed to recompense him for his services. "Because thou art my brother," or kinsman, he said, "shouldest thou serve me for nought? tell me, what shall thy wages be?" We are now introduced to Laban's family. He had two daughters—the elder named Leah, and the younger Rachel, already mentioned. Leah, we are told, was "tender-eyed," but Rachel was "beautiful and well-favoured." Interpreters are divided as to whether the expression *tender-eyed* indicates a beauty or a defect in Leah. The Arabic version, which is supported by Dr Adam Clarke, intimates that Leah had soft and beautiful eyes, while her sister Rachel excelled her in form and feature; but the majority follow the Septuagint in considering that Leah had weak or tender eyes, which the Orientals regard as a great defect. Jacob, who entertained a strong attachment for Rachel, immediately said to his uncle, "I will serve thee seven years for Rachel thy younger daughter." Laban closed with this proposal:—"It is better that I should give her to thee than that I should give her to another man."

This transaction requires some explanations, to understand properly what follows. It is noticed in various parts of the present work, that in the East it has been at all times customary for the bridegroom to make payments to the parents of his bride according to his means, and also to settle a dowry upon herself—a practice very different from that in European countries. We have repeated instances of this in the Scriptures. In the

case before us, Jacob, though otherwise an unexceptionable match, was altogether destitute of property, having at best no other prospect than a younger brother's share in the inheritance of his father, and he therefore offered his service for seven years to his uncle, which must have been equivalent to a large sum. These usages are found to exist at the present time. Burckhardt, in his account of Kerek, describes it as quite customary for a young man without property to serve the father of his intended bride five or six years in the capacity of a menial servant as a compensation. But this traveller gives a still more lucid illustration of the contract between Laban and Jacob, which occurred to himself at no great distance from the scene of the Patriarchal narrative. In his description of the inhabitants of a region south of Damascus called the Haouran, he says, "I once met with a young man who had served eight years for his food only. At the expiration of that period he obtained in marriage the daughter of his master, for whom he would otherwise have had to pay seven or eight hundred piastres. When I saw him he had been married three years, but he complained bitterly of his father-in-law, who continued to require of him the performance of the most servile offices without paying him any thing, and thus prevented him from setting himself up for himself and family." Laban said to Jacob when agreeing to the proposal—"It is better that I should give her to thee than to another man." As Jacob was the first cousin to Laban's daughters, he had, according to the usages of the country, the best claim to Rachel, while his elder twin brother had the preferable claim to Leah. It was consequently the proper course to adopt when he applied for Rachel in the first instance. Burckhardt informs us that among the Bedouin Arabs—a race who have preserved their manners and customs for thousands of years unaltered—a man has the exclusive right to the hand of his first cousin, and the father cannot refuse him if he offers a reasonable payment, which is always

less than what is demanded from one who is not a relative. The cousin is not obliged to marry her, but she cannot be married to another without his consent.

The inspired historian thus beautifully and touchingly expresses the attachment of Jacob to his betrothed bride. "And Jacob served seven years for Rachel, and they seemed to him but a few days, for the love he had to her." At the expiration of the time, Jacob demanded the fulfilment of the contract, to which Laban readily assented. He "gathered together all the men of the place, and made a feast," which, though it is not stated, probably lasted a week, for the Rabbins tell us that seven days' feasting was a matter of indispensable obligation upon all married men. In the evening, after the marriage ceremonies had been completed, Laban produced his daughter, apparently Rachel, but Jacob in the morning found to his astonishment and sorrow that Leah had been purposely substituted for her. The deception is easily accounted for, by referring for a moment to the marriage customs of the East. The bride is always closely veiled during the marriage ceremonies, and remains so while conducted to her husband's house or tent, which is always in the evening, and without lights. It was thus impossible to discover the deception until the morning.

This fraud of Laban, which was to Jacob a great affliction, was another of those trials which would remind him of the imposition he had himself practised in procuring his father's blessing. He complained bitterly to Laban of this imposition, and accused him of falsehood and deceit; but his uncle calmly intimated to him, "It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the first born." Bishop Patrick alleges that this excuse was a mere pretence, for we read of no such custom, but it seems very likely that Laban was correct in this statement, and this is the more probable, because it was not contradicted by Jacob; and the fault consisted in not acquainting him with the

customs of the country at the time his proposals were made and accepted. Laban added—"Fulfil her (Leah's) week, and we will give thee this (Rachel) also, for the service which thou shalt serve me other seven years." The meaning of this proposition is, that as marriages were celebrated according to custom by a feast of seven days, Jacob was to complete his marriage with Leah, and then, upon condition of another seven years' service, he would receive Rachel also, and keep her wedding feast seven days. There was no positive law against such marriages as this, and we must consider the different state of things before the promulgation of the Law, during the obligation of it, and under the dispensation of the Gospel. By the Gospel a plurality of wives and consanguinity in marriages are strictly prohibited, and this prohibition is ratified by the civil laws of every Christian kingdom. The Civil law makes this prohibition imperative under most severe penalties, but the Gospel requires it from Christians from a consideration and motive unknown either in the law of Nature or in the Law of Moses. "Ye are not your own," says St Paul, "for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's."

It is evident, notwithstanding the opinion of Calmet, that the marriage of Jacob with Leah and Rachel took place nearly at the same time. The Rabbins inform us that a man was required to allow seven days of feasting and rejoicing for every wife he took, though he should marry several on the same day. Laban gave Zilpah as a "handmaid" to his daughter Leah, and Bilhah to Rachel. This is still an existing usage in the East. Every father who has it in his power transfers to his daughter on her marriage some female slave of his household, who becomes a confidential friend to her mistress in the new house, though she is still a slave. This is very often most disagreeable to the husband, whose conduct and affairs are reported to his wife's relatives by this agent, but he cannot

prevent it, as he has little control over the female slaves in his household.

As Jacob's marriage with Leah was compulsory, Rachel became the favourite wife, towards whom he appears to have cherished throughout her life the most sincere and devoted affection. We are told that Leah *was hated*—an expression in Scripture language which simply means *was loved less* than Rachel. This neglecting of Leah was recompensed to her by the number of children she bore to Jacob. She became the mother of six sons, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun, and a daughter named Dinah; while Rachel was childless. Her envy was excited by the fact that Leah was her sister, and by the knowledge that she herself was the favourite wife. Fearing that she would probably lose her ascendancy over Jacob by being childless, she adopted the same expedient as Sarah did to Abraham in the case of Hagar, and which often happens in China and India at the present time when the lawful wife is childless. She gave her handmaid Bilhah to Jacob, who became the mother of Dan and Naphtali. Leah imitated her sister's example, and her handmaid Zilpah became the mother of Gad and Asher. Rachel soon afterwards became the mother of Joseph, and subsequently of Benjamin. These sons completed the family of the Patriarch, and became the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel.

During Jacob's residence with Laban he was remarkably prosperous. After the birth of Joseph he demanded permission from Laban to return to the residence of his father Isaac with his wives and his children. This was met by a request that he should still remain, and an offer to give him any remuneration he would propose, "for," said Laban, "I have learned by experience that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake." Jacob replied, "Thou shalt not give me any thing; if thou wilt do this thing for me, I will again feed and keep thy flock. I will pass through all thy flock to-day, removing from thence all the speckled

and spotted cattle, and all the brown cattle among the sheep, and the spotted and speckled among the goats; and of such shall be my hire. So shall my righteousness answer for me in time to come, when it shall come for my hire before my face; every one that is not speckled and spotted among the goats, and brown among the sheep, that shall be counted stolen from me." Laban agreed to the conditions, and "removed that day the he-goats that were ring-straked and spotted, and all the she-goats that were speckled and spotted, and every one that had some white in it, and all the brown among the sheep, and gave them into the hand of his sons; and he set three days' journey between himself and Jacob, and Jacob fed the rest of Laban's flocks." By an ingenious stratagem Jacob so arranged and classified or separated the flocks, that he put his own by themselves, and the "feebler were Laban's, and the stronger Jacob's." The inspired historian adds—"And the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maid-servants, and men-servants, and camels, and asses."

There is a difficulty about this new arrangement between Laban and Jacob which requires explanation. The meaning evidently is, that Laban was to drive away all the brown or speckled which were then in the flock, that Jacob should have only the white sheep and the uniformly coloured goats belonging to Laban to keep; and that he should have as his hire for keeping them only such of the breed of that flock as would be black of the sheep or speckled of the goats;—in short, the terms of the agreement were, that Laban should allow him all the sheep and goats of a certain description which should thereafter be born. Dr Adam Clarke supposes that Laban's selection of the animals defined by Jacob, and his sending them three days' journey distant from the others under the charge of his sons, was a stratagem to diminish Jacob's chances as much as possible, by leaving him with a flock which did not contain a single animal of the de-

scription to which he was to be entitled, and from which it might be expected that the smallest proportion of spotted or parti-coloured animals would proceed. This supposition is supported by the stratagem which Jacob adopted, and its successful results.

Laban and his family now beheld Jacob with the most envious jealousy, a strong feeling of dislike was excited by his prosperity, and they treated him with the grossest injustice. In a conversation with Rachel and Leah, we find Jacob informing them—"I see your father's countenance, that it is not toward me as before, but the God of my father hath been with me. And ye know that with all my power I have served your father, and your father hath deceived me, and changed my wages ten times, but God suffered him not to hurt me." To these and some other remonstrating observations on the conduct of Laban, Jacob's wives replied—"Is there yet any portion for us in our father's house? Are we not counted of him strangers? for he hath sold us, and hath quite devoured also our money. For all the riches which God hath taken from our father, that is ours and our children's; now, then, whatsoever God hath said unto thee, do." It appears from this statement that Laban's bargain had been exclusively for his own personal advantage, and we can only understand it as having reference to the customs connected with the dowry. Laban's daughters evidently considered their father's bargain with Jacob very disadvantageous to them, because it overlooked those provisions of a settlement which are usually made for females at the time of marriage. They were, moreover, quite as much dissatisfied with their father's unjust conduct as was their husband, and were prepared to accompany him wherever he might proceed.

Jacob had previously received a Divine communication, commanding him to return to the "land of his fathers, and to his kindred." His situation became daily more intolerably grievous, and he resolved to obey the Divine injunction,

and return with his wives and children, and the property he had acquired, to his own country. Laban had proceeded to a considerable distance to attend the shearing of his sheep, and Jacob availed himself of the opportunity which his absence afforded to prepare for and commence his journey. "Jacob rose up, and set his sons and his wives upon camels, and he carried away all his cattle, and all his goods which he had gotten, and the cattle of his getting in Padan-Aram, to go to Isaac his father in the Land of Canaan." The order of march at the removal of a pastoral family in those countries is the same at present as it is described in the history of Jacob, and of his father and grandfather. It appears that most of Jacob's people went on foot—his wives and children only being set upon camels.

Jacob had proceeded so far before his departure was known, that Laban was seven days in pursuing him before he could overtake him. The latter had been duly warned in a dream not to injure Jacob in any way. "God came to Laban the Syrian in a dream by night, and said unto him, Take heed that thou speak not to Jacob either good or bad," or, as it is in the margin, "from good to bad." Laban overtook Jacob at Mount Gilead—so called by anticipation, and in their interview the former remonstrated against and the latter justified the measure he had adopted. Rachel before her departure had stolen her father's images, or *teraphim*—images sometimes small and sometimes large, apparently in the human figure, or at least with a human head. From the various passages of Scripture in which they are mentioned, they do not appear to have been idols, properly so called, no primary worship being rendered to them; but, though they certainly were used by persons who professed the true worship of God, as they subsequently proved a snare to idolatry, they were included in the general interdiction of images by the Law of Moses, and were denounced by the Prophets. Rachel's motives for secreting the *teraphim* of her

father have been differently interpreted, and it is impossible to solve such a dubious question. It has been variously supposed that the images were of precious metal, and that she appropriated them to compensate for the loss of her dowry sustained by her through Laban's bargain with Jacob—that by taking them she might deprive her father of the means of discovering the flight of her husband—or that she expected to bring prosperity from the household of her father to that of Jacob. It has also been suggested that she intended to cure her father of his idolatrous propensities by depriving him of his *teraphim*; while some think that she and her sister were infected by the same superstitious as her father, and wished to practise them in the Land of Canaan. Whatever might be her motives the transaction was unknown to Jacob, and when Laban in his remonstrance complained of the robbery, the Patriarch consented to an examination of every tent, and declared that the individual who was guilty of the robbery should be put to death. A diligent search was made in all the tents, including those of the women, but the images were not found, and Laban, suspecting that his charge was unjust, inclined to conciliatory measures. Rachel eluded the search by a curious expedient. She had “taken the images, and put them in the camel's furniture, and sat upon them.”—“Rachel,” says Harmer, “probably rode, after the Arab mode, upon an *hiran*, which is a piece of wood, about six ells long, laid upon the saddle, which is of wood, in order to make the sitting more easy. This *hiran* is made use of as a mattress, when they stop for a night in a place, and it serves them to lodge on, as their wallets serve for cushions or a bolster. It was probably the *hiran*, part of the camel's furniture, under which she hid her father's *teraphim*, and on which she sat according to their customs in her tent, and therefore unsuspected.” The reason she assigned to her father for not rendering to him the usual courtesy was—“Let it not displease my lord that I

cannot rise up before thee, for the custom of women is upon me.” Jacob was indignant at Laban when he found the search unsuccessful, and believing the whole to be a false accusation, he upbraided him in strong terms for his conduct not only on this but on various former occasions. He concluded his reproachful remonstrance in the most energetic manner:—“I have been twenty years in thy service; I served thee fourteen years for thy two daughters, and six years for thy cattle, and thou hast changed my wages ten times. Except the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac, had been with me, surely thou hadst sent me away now empty. God hath seen mine affliction and the labour of my hands, and rebuked thee yesternight.” Laban replied in a friendly manner, asserting his near relationship to his daughters and their children, and proposing terms of an alliance, which should be commemorated in future times by a pillar or pile of stones. Laban called this heap of stones by the Syriac designation *Jegar-sahadutha*, signifying *the heap of witness*, and Jacob designated it in the Hebrew, *Gilved* and *Mizpeh*, which means a *watch tower* or *beacon*. A town afterwards built near the scene of this transaction took the name given to this pile of stones, and it is occasionally called *Mizpeh of Gilead*, to distinguish it from other towns of the same name. After the alliance had been concluded in the most solemn manner between Jacob and his father-in-law, “early in the morning Laban rose up, and kissed his sons (grandsons) and his daughters, and blessed them; and Laban departed, and returned to his place.”

Now left to himself, Jacob continued his journey unmolested, and came to a place which he called *Mahanaim*, or *two hosts* or *camps*, because the angels of God there appeared to him. From this place he sent messengers to his brother Esau in the Land of Seir, giving an account of his circumstances, and all that had occurred during his residence with Laban. The messengers returned, and informed

him that Esau was advancing to meet him at the head of four hundred men. This intelligence excited the greatest alarm in the mind of Jacob, who feared that the visit would be hostile, and that Esau would revenge the deprivation of his father's blessing. The Patriarch addressed an earnest prayer to Jehovah for protection, and then proceeded to dispose his family and followers into two companies, that if Esau attacked the one, the other might have an opportunity of escaping. He set aside a suitable present for his brother, and having given prudential instructions to his domestics, he crossed the river Jabbok during the night, and placed his wives and children on the other side to ensure their safety. It was during this night of suspense and anxiety, when "left alone," that a mysterious person "wrestled with him until the breaking of the day." This extraordinary visitor, when he found that he was not prevailing against Jacob, touched the "hollow of his thigh," namely, the upper part, or hip-bone, where the joint is, and "the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him." This bodily affliction, as Bishop Hall observes, was left to humble him, and at the same time to testify that he with whom he strove was not a mere man. The angel, supposed by some to have been the second Person of the Glorious Trinity, said to Jacob, "Let me go, for the day breaketh;" but the Patriarch replied in the memorable words—"I will not let thee go, except thou bless me." On this occasion Jacob received the appellation of *Israel*, by which his descendants the Jews were afterwards distinguished. "Thy name," said the mysterious wrestler, "shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel, for as a prince hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed." Jacob called the name of this place *Peniel*, or *the face of God*, saying, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." The inspired historian inserts in his account of this interesting transaction the origin of an observance which has been followed

by the Jews to the present time. "And as he passed over Peniel, the sun rose upon him, and he halted upon his thigh. Therefore the children of Israel eat not of the sinew which shrank, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day; because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew that shrank." The Jews do not know what sinew this was, nor even whether it was in the right or left thigh, and therefore abstain from both the hind limbs of animals, lest they should inadvertently eat the interdicted sinew.

Esau met Jacob in a different manner from what the latter expected. He was kind, affectionate, generous, and unreserved, his whole deportment towards his brother showing that he had forgiven the treatment he had received from him. (See *ESAU*.) Jacob declined the invitation of Esau to accompany him to Seir, and the brothers separated. The Patriarch journeyed to the place afterwards called *Succoth*, which means *booths*, because he there encamped, and made booths for his cattle. Thence he went to Shechem, and purchased a field from the children of Hamor for a hundred pieces of money, or *lamb*s, as it is stated in the margin, and he erected there an altar which he designated *El-elohe-Israel*, or *God the God of Israel*.

Shortly after Jacob's encampment near Shechem there occurred a very distressing incident connected with his daughter Dinah. The most outrageous violence was done to her by Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, who is styled the prince of the country. The reader is referred to the history (Gen. xxxiv.) for all the details of this transaction and its consequences. The injury done to Dinah was revenged by Simeon and Levi, her brothers by the same mother, who with their domestics boldly entered the city, and put all the male inhabitants to the sword, including Hamor and his son Shechem. Jacob resented the violent conduct of his sons, accusing them of not only exposing him and his household, who were comparatively few in number,

to danger from the Canaanites and Perizzites, but of having made him odious to all the country as a murderer, a robber, and a breaker of his faith. Notwithstanding the provocation, Jacob never forgot the conduct of his two sons on this occasion; he remembered it to the end of his life, and the care he took to notice it upon his deathbed gives us a much better idea of it than the writings of some Rabbins who have not only excused but even commended their conduct.—“Simeon and Levi,” he said, “are brethren; instruments of cruelty are in their habitations. O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united; for in their anger they slew a man, and in their self-will they digged down a wall. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel; I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.”

While deliberating whither to direct his course from Shechem, Jacob was instructed by God to erect an altar at Bethel—a place where he had early received assurances of the Divine favour and protection. In obedience to the injunction of Jehovah he erected the altar at Bethel, purifying his household at the same time of all the “strange gods which were in their hands, and all their ear-rings which were in their ears”—the former probably the idols of the Shechemites taken amid the plunder which followed the massacre, and the latter containing the representations of false gods, or some symbol of their power, and viewed as amulets or charms. All these objects of superstition he concealed in the ground under an oak near Shechem. Jacob now set out from Bethel on his journey to his father, but on his way he suffered a severe domestic calamity. His beloved wife Rachel died in child-birth of her son Benjamin, or Ben-oni, as she called him, which signifies *the son of my sorrow*. Overwhelmed with grief at this great bereavement, the Patriarch buried this object of his early and tender attachment on the way to Ephrath, otherwise called

Bethlehem, and he “set a pillar over her grave; that is the pillar of Rachel’s grave unto this day.” The reputed tomb of Rachel is still pointed out, of a very humble description—a small square building surmounted by a dome, resembling the common tombs of sheikhs and saints in Arabia and Egypt. “The spot,” says Mr Carne, “is as wild and solitary as can well be conceived; no palms or cypresses give their shelter from the blast; not a single tree spreads its shade where the ashes of the beautiful mother of Israel rest. Yet there is something in this sepulchre of the wilderness that excites a deeper interest than more splendid or revered ones. The tombs of Zacharias and Absalom in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, or that of the kings in the Plain of Jeremiah, the traveller looks at with careless indifference; beside that of Rachel his fancy wanders to the land of the people of the East—to the power of beauty that could so long make banishment sweet—to the devoted companion of the wanderer, who deemed all troubles light for her sake.”

Soon afterwards Jacob arrived at Mamre, where his venerable father resided. His mother Rebekah had been some time dead, and Jacob was now the comfort of Isaac’s old age. No particulars are given of the meeting between the father and the son after their long separation, but Isaac would at once perceive in the return of Jacob, with so many children and numerous servants, the promise of God in progressive operation which had been made to Abraham and to himself. Jacob continued at Mamre till his father’s death, and he was assisted by his brother Esau in laying the mortal remains of the aged Patriarch in the sepulchre where reposed in peace the ashes of Abraham, Sarah, and Rebekah.

At this time Joseph, being about seventeen years of age, and the favourite son of Jacob, became the object of jealousy to his brothers. They meditated his destruction, and actually threw him into a pit that he might perish of hunger, but they were persuaded by Judah to sell

him to a caravan of Ishmaelitish merchants proceeding on their vocation to Egypt. When they returned to Jacob they feigned a story of Joseph having been torn to pieces by a wild beast, and produced his "coat of many colours" stained with blood, as a proof of the truth of their statement; but it is evident that their afflicted father scarcely believed them; though "he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days." The Patriarch long refused any consolation for the loss of Joseph. He was the "son of his old age"—not the youngest son, but probably because he was the first son of his beloved Rachel after a long season of barrenness, and because, at the period when the unnatural combination was formed against Joseph, he was capable of affording more comfort to Jacob, now in his declining years, than his younger brother Benjamin. The Patriarch refused to be comforted, saying, "For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning."—"Thus," says the inspired historian, "his father wept for him."

After the lapse of some years Jacob received the grateful intelligence that Joseph was not only alive, but in the highest station at the court of Pharaoh. He fainted in the arms of his sons at this welcome intimation; he doubted at first the truth of the statement—his "heart fainted, for he believed them not;" but when he found himself surrounded by the presents of the son of his beloved Rachel, and by the chariots of Egypt, sent to convey him and his family to that country from the sore famine which then scourged the whole of Canaan and the neighbouring districts, he could only exclaim, in the fulness of his heart—"It is enough; Joseph my son is yet alive; I will go and see him before I die." On his way he stopped at Beersheba to offer sacrifices to God, and thus to express his gratitude and his desire of continued protection. He received the most ample assurances of the Divine favour. "I am God, the God of thy father; fear not to go down into Egypt, for I will there make

of thee a great nation. I will go down with thee into Egypt, and I will also surely bring thee up again; and Joseph shall put his hand upon thine eye." As he approached the borders of Egypt he received a message from Joseph, requesting him to meet him in the Land of Goshen, lying between the Red Sea and the Nile—a fruitful territory, adapted to the pastoral occupations of his family. The interview between such a father and such a son will be best conceived by a mind of pious and virtuous sensibility. Joseph fell on his father's neck, and "wept on his neck a good while." The venerable Patriarch's feelings were too great for utterance—he remembered Rachel, for whose love he had thought no toil too great—for whom, as he told her father Laban, "in the day the drought had consumed him, and the frost by night, and the sleep had departed from his eyes"—he was now embracing his and her long lost son, whose virtues, abilities, and integrity, had raised him to the highest station in the then most powerful kingdom of the world; and in the excitement of his feelings and in the warmth of the paternal embrace, he could only utter the grateful aspiration—"Now let me die, since I have seen thy face, because thou art yet alive."

Joseph obtained Pharaoh's permission for his father and his brethren to settle in the district of Goshen with their families, and he conducted thither the venerable Patriarch. Previous to this he was introduced to Pharaoh by Joseph, who was evidently greatly impressed by his appearance. During the interview Pharaoh inquired "How old art thou?" The reply of Jacob is well known, and is practically applicable to persons of every rank and condition, who, when reflecting on the anxieties and disappointments of life, can appropriate the Patriarch's language to themselves, and bear ample testimony to its truth. Jacob said to Pharaoh, "The days of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years: few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the

days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage"—referring probably to his grandfather Abraham, who lived one hundred and seventy-five years, and to his father Isaac, who lived one hundred and eighty years. His days had consequently been *few* in comparison with theirs, and *evil*, because full of labour, care, and sorrow on many occasions; for, though Jacob had been up to this period a prosperous man in many respects, he had also encountered many trials. He fled from Esau, and served Laban twenty years, who grievously oppressed and deceived him. He was compelled to leave Laban, and he lived in the fear of Esau. He was afflicted in his daughter Dinah, in his sons Simeon, Levi, and Reuben, in the sons of Judah, and in Tamar, besides the death of Rachel, and his grief for the loss of Joseph, and the sending of Benjamin into Egypt—which caused him to exclaim, in the anguish of his heart, "All these things are against me."

Jacob lived seventeen years in Egypt, where his family greatly prospered and multiplied. When he apprehended that his life was drawing to a close he sent for Joseph, and obtained a promise from him that his body should be carried to Canaan, and deposited by the side of Abraham and Isaac in the field of Machpelah. "If now I have found grace in thy sight," he said, "put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and deal kindly and truly with me: bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt; but I will lie with my fathers, and thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying-place." Besides the desire natural to men of being buried with their forefathers, Jacob had a peculiar reason for his request. He knew that the country which contained the ashes of Abraham and Isaac was to be the inheritance of his descendants, and that God in due time would put them in possession of it; and he calculated that they would long the more earnestly to possess the country in which the bodies of their ancestors were buried. Jacob required an oath from

Joseph, not because he at all doubted the inclination of his son to fulfil his promise, but to make it an argument for Pharaoh's sanction of the proceeding, which Joseph was bound by the most sacred obligation to discharge.

When Jacob was dying he adopted Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph, as his own, declaring that in the division of the Promised Land they were to receive a double portion, and to be considered as the heads of two distinct tribes. This part of his closing scene is peculiarly affecting. He informed Joseph where his mother Rachel was buried, and then ordered him to bring his sons to receive his blessing. By Divine direction Ephraim was preferred in this blessing to his elder brother Manasseh. Joseph attempted to correct his father, thinking that it was an accidental mistake caused by the dimness of his sight, but the Patriarch replied, "I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great; but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he; and his seed shall become a multitude of nations. And he blessed them that day, saying, In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh: and he set Ephraim before Manasseh." The fine and fervent invocation of the Patriarch on this occasion shows the keenness of his feelings and the enthusiasm of his character:—"God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my father Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth."

Having delivered to his sons, who were collected round him, his final blessing, and his dying predictions of the events which were to happen to their several descendants in future times, Jacob expired in the hundred and forty-seventh year of his age, B.C. 1689. As soon as he had ceased to breathe Joseph fell upon his face, and wept upon him, and

kissed him. The body of Jacob was embalmed by order of his son, "and forty days were fulfilled for him, for so are fulfilled the days of those which are embalmed, and the Egyptians mourned for him three score and ten days." At the end of that customary time for mourning Joseph intimated to the household of Pharaoh his father's last injunction, as he could not, being a mourner, and consequently defiled according to the notions of the Egyptians, speak to the king himself, or even enter into his presence.—"If now," he said, "I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, in the ears of Pharaoh, saying, My father made me swear, saying, Lo, I die; in my grave which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt thou bury me. Now, therefore, let me go up, I pray thee, and bury my father, and I will come again." The permission was granted, and Joseph "went up to bury his father, and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt, and all the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and his father's house. And there went up with him both chariots and horsemen; and it was a very great company." When they came to the threshing-floor of Atad—uncertain whether the name of a place or of a man—they "mourned with a great and very sore lamentation, and he made a mourning for his father seven days." We are not told how this lamentation was conducted, but in after times they sat with their faces covered, having ashes sprinkled on their heads, crying out with a mournful voice, sometimes wringing, and at other times clapping their hands together, smiting their breasts or their thighs, with many other expressions of sorrow. The *seven days* of mourning intimated was the time of public mourning in succeeding times among the Jews. It is not easy to ascertain why this numerous cavalcade of mourners made the threshing-floor of Atad the scene of their lamentations rather than the place of interment. "Perhaps," says Dr Wells, "it was a place

more convenient to stay in for seven days than the field of Machpelah; or perhaps it might be the custom at the entrance of the country, whither they were carrying the body for burial, to fall into lamentations, which they might repeat over the grave." The Canaanites were astonished at the great assemblage and the demonstrations of sorrow they evinced, and gave to the threshing-floor of Atad the appellation of *Abel-Mizraim, or the mourning of the Egyptians*. After depositing the body of Jacob in the cave of Machpelah, Joseph, his brothers, and all the company who went with him, returned to Egypt, where the descendants of Jacob remained till the time of the *Exodus*, or departure for the Promised Land under Moses and Aaron.

The character of this distinguished Patriarch is fully developed in his history. He is the first of whom we read in the Scriptures who particularly declared the future state of every one of his sons when on his deathbed, and his last words may be called prophecies rather than benedictions, for all of them contain predictions, while some of them intimate no blessing except that of being reckoned heads of their tribes, and inheritors of the Promised Land. If the life of Jacob was embittered by cares and troubles, his death was tranquil, and in the arms of his own sons. When he had "made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into the bed, and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people." But he was peculiarly happy in dying in the presence of his favourite son Joseph, and the practical moral deduced from this important circumstance in the history of Jacob is eloquently expressed by Dr Paley. "Thus died, and was honoured in his death, the founder of the Jewish nation, who, amidst many mercies, many visitations, and sudden and surprising vicissitudes of afflictions and joy, found it the greatest blessing of his varied and eventful life, that he had been the father of a dutiful and affectionate son. It has been said, and as I believe truly, that there is no virtuous

quality belonging to the human character, of which there is not some eminent and distinct example to be found in the Bible—no relation in which we can be placed—no duty which we have to discharge, but we may observe a pattern for it in the sacred history. Of the duty of children to parents, of a son to his father, maintained under great singularities and variations of fortune—undiminished, nay, rather increased by absence, by distance, by unexampled success, by remote and foreign connections, we may see, in this most ancient of all histories, as conspicuous and amiable an instance as can be met with in the records of the world, in the purest and best ages of its existence.”

JAEI, the wife of Heber the Kenite, treacherously killed Sisera, the general of the king of Canaan, after his defeat by Deborah and Barak. The warrior betook himself in his flight, wearied and dispirited, to the tent of Heber, who was a friendly ally of his master, and in the absence of Heber himself was met by his wife, who addressed him in the most courteous manner—“Turn in, my lord, turn in to me, fear not.” He accepted the invitation, and entered the tent, where he lay down, and requested a little water to drink. Jael opened a bottle of milk—the best beverage she possessed, out of respect to him, and gave it to him. He requested her to stand at the door of the tent while he refreshed himself, and to deny that there was any one within, if such a question should be asked by the pursuers. He sunk fast asleep, and it was then that Jael took a nail, and “an hammer in her hand, and went softly unto him, and smote the nail into his temples, and fastened it into the ground, and he died.” Barak, who was pursuing Sisera, shortly after came up, and was invited by Jael into the tent, where he found the fugitive general dead. The conduct of Jael in destroying Sisera after the hospitality she had exhibited was certainly such as would, under ordinary circumstances, have been deemed most treacherous and dishonourable, and

we can only ascribe this action to some overruling impulse which made her the instrument of Divine vengeance against a bitter enemy of the Israelites, for hospitality is held so sacred among the Arabs, to a nomade tribe of whom Jael belonged, that a violation of it is the greatest reproach with which they can be assailed. She is honourably mentioned in the triumphant song of Deborah and Barak:—“Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be, blessed shall she be above women in the tent.” Even her breach of hospitality is commended, and the manner in which she accomplished Sisera’s death; but we ought to recollect that the conduct of Jael is written solely for our instruction, and at the same time we ought to be cautious in condemning or approving what God has neither condemned nor approved.

JAIR, a Gileadite, is merely mentioned as a judge of Israel, whose administration continued twenty-two years. Nothing is known of what befell the Israelites during that period. It is supposed that he and his predecessor Tola were part of the time contemporary, Jair governing the tribes on one side, and Tola those on the other side, of the Jordan. We are told that “he had thirty sons that rode on thirty ass colts, and they had thirty cities, which are called Havoth-jair unto this day, which are in the land of Gilead.” Other towns had been called by the same name by a former Jair, who was probably an ancestor of this judge of Israel, Numb. xxxii. 41; Deut. iii. 14. Jair was buried in Canaan.—The father of Mordecai was called JAIR, Esther ii. 5. There are other persons mentioned of this name, 1 Chron. ii. 22; xx. 5.

JAMBRES, an Egyptian magician, mentioned by St Paul, with JANNES, as having “withstood Moses.” The Rabbins have a foolish tradition that they were the sons of Balaam—an idea which requires no refutation.

JAMES, son of Zebedee and Salome. Zebedee was a citizen of Capernaum or Bethsaida, and by occupation a fisher-

man on the neighbouring lake of Genesareth. From the circumstance mentioned by Mark, that he had hired servants to assist him, it is concluded that he was a man of some considerable wealth. James is supposed to have been the elder of the two brothers, and was born probably several years before his future Master. They diligently followed the same occupation as their father, and it is likely that they had heard the preaching of the Baptist, as well as that of our Saviour, before they were called to follow him as regular disciples. It has been elsewhere remarked, that it was not till the second year of our Lord's public ministry that he began to call around him men who were to be his stated disciples. He had given repeated proofs that he had a commission from heaven, and the sons of Zebedee, when the invitation, "Follow me," was addressed to them by Christ, hesitated not to leave their aged father and their nets, and laborious trade, and to devote themselves to the much nobler but more arduous and dangerous duty of "fishers of men." These two brothers, along with Simon Peter, were the three who were admitted to the most intimate converse and confidence of their Master. James is reported to have been distinguished among the twelve for the dignity, and decisive steadfastness, and activity of his character, John for the amiable devotedness of affection, which was proof against all dangers which daunted and appalled the boldest, and Peter for impetuous zeal and forward courage, not unfrequently approaching to thoughtless rashness. As Christ had done in the case of Peter, he did also in that of the two brothers—he bestowed a new name upon them—*Boanerges*, or *sons of thunder*, indicative of the mighty effect which their eloquence and preaching were to produce in the world. Whether it was that there was something naturally superior in the intellectual and moral character of these three not possessed in so high a degree by the rest of the disciples, as we are inclined to think, or whether it was because they were to be exposed to severer as well as earlier

trials and persecutions than any of the others, as Dr Cave thinks, we need not remind the reader that these three favoured and distinguished disciples hold the most prominent place in the Apostolic college, so long as it continued entire, and labouring in Jerusalem and the country of Judea.

The exclusive honour of intimacy to which these two brothers, along with Peter, were admitted by Jesus, inspired their minds with ambitious thoughts. It would seem that their father Zebedee had died shortly after they were nominated Apostles, and they became heirs to his property. It is not hinted that Peter had any possession except the house in which he lived, and the fishing boat in which he pursued his occupation, but after the noble confession which he made, when many went back from following Jesus, and the bestowal of the power of the keys upon him, there were frequent jealousies and envyings among the rest in regard to him, and mistaken disputes as to the first places of honour and trust in that kingdom which they expected the Messiah was speedily to erect in Judea. Christ had gradually opened up to them the spiritual character of that kingdom, and by many a practical illustration had inculcated upon them the necessity of lowliness of mind, as the most essential grace and qualification for being great under the reign of the gospel. Still, to the very last, their fond Jewish notions of power and glory under the victorious reign of the royal Son of David clung to them. Christ had repeatedly told them that he was to be rejected, and his claims set at nought—that he was to be crucified by the priests and rulers of the Jews, but always added that he would rise again on the third day. The first part of the prediction they were with the utmost difficulty brought to believe, and seem certainly to have repeatedly forgot. When they did believe it, they proceeded to found their hopes of glory and authority on what their Master would do after his resurrection. With these mingled feelings, the two brothers insti-

gated their mother, on the last journey toward Jerusalem, before the passover at which Christ declared he was to suffer, to request of him that her two sons might sit on his right and left hand, or enjoy the chief dignity in that heavenly kingdom which he was about to establish. He knew the aspiring thoughts which had dictated the request, and with a gentle censure of the perverse misapprehension and ignorance which still possessed them, again made them understand that those who would reign with him must also suffer with him, must drink of the cup of which he was destined to drink, and be baptized with the baptism of blood which was so soon to be his portion. This, he told them, they would in due time be ready to undergo, but put a final end to the jealous rivalry, by telling them that such honours should be given to those only for whom they were ordained by his heavenly Father.

We, in these days, might well think it wonderful that they should be so slow to apprehend and understand what seems now so clear—what was predicted in all their own Scriptures, from the beginning, in regard to their promised Messiah. Yet it is deeply instructive, because it is natural. We find in their future history that their preconceived notions of the Messiah's kingdom, with many of their Jewish prejudices, stuck to their fond belief till they were baptized with the fulness of the Holy Spirit—and even after that, some of them had a natural propensity to give in to the peculiar observances of their own preparatory dispensation—those “old things” which were now for ever to be abolished, and to pass away. Even after the request mentioned above, and the instruction they had received as to its unreasonable nature, we find these “sons of thunder” desirous of giving a terrible verification of their name by calling fire down from heaven to destroy all the inhabitants of an inhospitable Samaritan village, who refused to receive and entertain them on their way to the passover. So slowly do the doctrines of the truth, and the gentle charity of the gospel, find their way to

the firm belief and warm affections of the human heart.

We need not minutely remark upon the incidents which took place between these circumstances, which throw strong light upon the character of this apostle, and those that followed till the ascension of the Son of Man, and the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. These are more or less common to all the rest, and are noticed under the names to which they are most applicable. We have not the guide of inspired and infallible history in regard to the labours and the trials of St James from the time when the apostles entered upon their duty of preaching the gospel to all the world, now fully understanding the nature of its doctrines, and infallibly confirmed in their faith. The Spanish ecclesiastical writers of the middle ages pretend that after preaching to the Jews of the dispersion, he travelled into the utmost bounds of the west, and established the doctrines of the cross in their country. But this is plainly a fond fancy analogous to that of the Romans, who believe that St Peter was bishop of their city for twenty-five years. The Spaniards honour him as their patron saint, and relate that his bones were miraculously transported to Compostella, where they say multitudes of miracles have been wrought by their virtue. Much less is any credit to be given to the story that he visited England and Ireland, planting the gospel in these countries, and then returning to Jerusalem. Upon the death of the first martyr, Stephen, which happened two years after the crucifixion of Christ, there was a great persecution of the church, and the believers were scattered abroad, but we are informed by the writer of the Acts, that the Apostles still resided in a body at Jerusalem. From the excitement and discussion raised in the Apostolic college by the conduct of Peter, in preaching to Cornelius and the Gentiles, many years after this, it is necessary to conclude that they did not go beyond the bounds of Judea till at least after the death of James. No other evidence is requisite to prove that all the Spanish

stories of St James' labours in the west are only the figments of fabling superstition.

About three years after this *first* intimation that the time was come when the word of eternal life should be preached to the Gentiles also, or fifteen years after the crucifixion of Christ, we again find St James at Jerusalem, wherever he had been, and whatever had been his labours during the interval. Herod Agrippa, the grandson of Herod the Great, who had been made tetrarch of Galilee by Caligula, was appointed king over all Judea by Claudius. This politic prince, who possessed much of the crafty disposition of his grandfather, on coming to Jerusalem, and entering on his royal power, was anxious to gain the applause of his new subjects by doing an act which he knew would be popular. We are informed by Josephus that he was a zealous adherent to the Pharisaic form of religion; and he knew that nothing would be more acceptable to his bigoted countrymen than to put down the doctrines of Jesus Christ. He therefore "put forth his hands to vex certain of the church," and the decided character and active energy of James soon pointed him out as a suitable victim of his selfish arts. He commanded him to be apprehended, and led to execution, after he had been convicted of being a teacher of the doctrines of Jesus of Nazareth. He was now to drink of that cup of which he had professed his readiness to his Master to partake. But his earthly ambition had been long before dissipated, and he acquiesced in the appointment with a higher and nobler ambition of a spiritual nature. He was the first of all the Apostles who was a martyr unto blood of the truths which he had taught. We learn from Suidas and Eusebius that the calm self-possession and noble dignity of his conduct, during the scene of his trial, had such an effect upon the officer who led him to execution, who seems also to have been his accuser, that he was convinced of the truth of Christianity, confessed his fault, was forgiven, and blessed by the Apostle, pro-

fessed his belief in Christ, and was beheaded along with St James. Thus did he, first of all the Apostles, gain the crown of martyrdom, infinitely more glorious than any earthly sovereignty, which in his once mistaken ambition he longed after, and thus was the promise and prediction of his Saviour fulfilled. We need scarcely mention the more miserable fate of the ten times more mistaken ambition of popular fame which soon overtook his persecutor and murderer. He had persuaded the Jews to give divine honours to Caligula, the fawning rabble of Cæsarea shouted in his own honour that "his was the voice of a god, and not of a man," when the hand of God fell upon him, and the vain idol and his senseless worshippers were forced to see that he was only a helpless reptile of the earth, when, in the glory of his pride, he was eaten up of worms.

As to the story of the carrying of the Apostle's bones to Spain by Cesiphon, of their miraculous disappearance, of their recovery, and being the means of converting a Spanish king and queen, and the place of their final repose being the "great storehouse of miracles open to the whole world," according to Baronius, there is not the slightest ground for giving any credit to such fables of a later and degenerate age. All will agree in the reasonableness of the quaint but bitterly sarcastic remark of Cave, "I should not scruple to believe that these mighty miracles form one of the best arguments to prove that his bones were translated thither, could I but be assured that such miracles were done there." Any one who will take the trouble of looking over the "camel load" of fabulous miracles (reported in the *Acta Sanctorum*), said to have been wrought by the apocryphal bones of St Iago di Compostella, will have little hesitation in saying that the learned Doctor ran no great risk in promising such a conditional faith.

JAMES THE LESS, surnamed the Just, son of Alphæus and Mary. There is very considerable difficulty in settling the parentage and identity of this apostle. In the Apostolic college it is certain that

there were two, and only two, of this name, James the son of Zebedee, and James the son of Alphæus, also supposed to be the son of Mary, called the *sister* of the holy virgin. Among those women who were spectators of the crucifixion, Mark enumerates "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Less, and of Joses," and John mentions "Mary the mother of Jesus, and his mother's sister Mary, *wife* (as our translators have inserted) of Cleopas." Cleopas and Alphæus are supposed to be different names of the same individual, varying in form in the different writers in the Greek, but identical in the Hebrew. If this Mary was *sister* of the virgin, and *wife* of Cleopas, then "James and Joses, and Simon and Jude, and their sisters," were cousins-german to Jesus Christ, and thence, according to the common custom of the Jews, called his brothers and sisters. This account seems plain and consistent; but from the frequency of the name among the Jews, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and others among the ancient ecclesiastical writers, as well as Cave and other distinguished authors in modern days, maintain that the Mary here called the sister of the virgin was only her cousin, and the *daughter*, not the wife, of Cleopas, and that her sons mentioned are not the apostles, but only disciples. All these writers maintain that James and Joses, and Simon and Jude, with their sisters, alluded to by the inhabitants of Nazareth, were the children of Joseph by a former marriage, and that the Mary who is called their mother was none else but the blessed virgin, though in reality she was only their mother-in-law. There are difficulties in either mode of stating the genealogy, and as the sacred writers have not thought it necessary to obviate and remove them, we leave them as matters of no practical importance. The chief difficulty originates in the latitude with which the Jews used the word brethren, and in the present case of many individuals being called by the same name. We may remark, however, that those who hold that these "brethren of our Lord"

were the sons of Joseph by a former wife, have to remove most difficulties. They have to hold that that wife was the widow of his brother Alphæus or Cleopas, whom he married to raise up seed to his brother, and of course that his brother was dead, long before Joseph espoused the Virgin Mary, as well as his brother's widow, his own former wife, while to common readers it appears that both father and mother of James and Joses were alive. We shall take the easiest solution of the difficulty by supposing that Mary the mother of James the Less was the cousin of the Virgin, and that Cleopas or Alphæus was a near relation of Joseph, so that in the general sense their children were usually called brothers and sisters of our Lord. Nothing particular is mentioned of his occupation before he was called to be an apostle, nor of his conduct during the whole of our Lord's personal ministry upon earth. St Paul mentions that after his resurrection and various appearances to the apostles and disciples, Christ was "seen of James." This must have been many days, even weeks, after the resurrection, for it was after he had shown himself to the five hundred brethren on a mountain in Galilee. This shows the absurdity of the story which Jerome quotes from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, that James had vowed at the last supper never to taste bread till his Lord was risen, and that Christ set bread before him, and told him to eat, for that the "Son of man was truly risen from among them that slept." There is no intimation given in any of the Evangelists that James was absent from the stated meetings of the Apostles, or that he or any one else, except Thomas, doubted that Christ was really risen from the dead. From the history of the Acts of the Apostles, and the statements of the ancient fathers of the church, it appears that he resided constantly in Jerusalem. From that faithful record, it is clear that for some time at least Peter was the boldest and most prominent among the Apostles in declaring the divinity of

Christ and the truth of his doctrines. But whether it was that his ardent zeal soon sent him forth to preach the Gospel over the country, or that the general voice fixed upon the elder James as the most peculiarly fitted to take the lead in the deliberations of the Apostles, the son of Zebedee seems at first to have been the most exalted in the body of the humble followers of Jesus. But after his martyrdom, it is equally clear that James the Less was advanced to the dangerous pre-eminence of president of the apostolic council, and perpetual superintendent or bishop of the church of Jerusalem. This is not indeed directly stated by any of the writers of the New Testament in express words, but we are led fairly to infer it from several circumstances mentioned regarding him. After the death of James the elder, when Peter was imprisoned by Agrippa, and delivered by the angel, he requested his friends to tell his miraculous escape to this apostle first—"Go, show these things to James, and to the brethren." He is mentioned by Paul as the first of the three, James, Cephas, and John, who "seemed to be pillars in the church, who gave him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." In the great dispute in regard to imposing upon the Gentile converts many of the peculiar rites of the Mosaic dispensation, it was he that summed up the purport of the opinions given, and pronounced authoritatively what was the decision of the council. Declaring his sense of the purpose of God in regard to the salvation of the Gentiles, as expressed in the prophecies, he concludes by giving his "sentence, that they should not trouble the Gentiles who were turned unto God." He gives not forth his own dogmatic decretal, however, as one who "lorded it over the heritage of God," for the epistle which was sent runs in the name of all the Apostles equally, though he, as permanent pastor of the church at Jerusalem, and nearest of kindred to Jesus Christ, most probably presided at the deliberation, though Peter and John and Paul were there. And Paul, in the second chapter of the Epistle

to the Galatians, when censuring the weak temporizing of Peter at Antioch, gives to James the office of first apostle in Jerusalem—"For before that certain came from James, Peter did eat with the Gentiles, but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself." We are fully entitled to hold that all the Apostles received equal authority and dignity from their Master, but when they divided their labours, and mutually assigned the spheres in which they were to move, we learn from the old ecclesiastical historians that the several apostles were acknowledged as the bishops or superintendents of the cities or districts in which they more or less permanently laboured. But if it is true, as the history of the Acts seems to intimate, that James, the son of Zebedee, was president of the apostolic body for several years before his death, Eusebius must be in error when he says that James the Less was bishop of Jerusalem for thirty years. The former was put to death about 44 A.D., and if James the Just was then appointed to the regular and permanent oversight of that church, he could have held the office no more than about nineteen years.

All ancient history, sacred as well as profane, speaks very highly of the character of this Apostle, as a man of the warmest benevolence, the most ardent devotion, the most unwearied zeal in the discharge of his dangerous duty, of immovable love to the truth, yet of the most prudent discretion and condescension to the scruples of weaker brethren. He says, in the only Epistle which he wrote, at least which remains, that "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much;" and it is reported, says Dr Cave, that "prayer was his constant business and delight; he seemed to live upon it, and to trade in nothing but the frequent returns of converse with heaven, and was wont therefore to retire alone into the Temple to pray, which he always performed kneeling, till by his daily devotions his knees were become as hard and brawny as a camel's." Such is the high character given of him, both by

friends and enemies, and so greatly revered was he by the people that they used, we are told by Eusebius, to flock after him, and take delight even to touch the hem of his garment.

The only Epistle which he wrote is addressed to the "twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," and was intended to encourage to patience and resignation under the grievous persecutions which were now thickening in darker judgment over the devoted country of the Jews. If they hated the Christians, and treated them with all cruelty, the remorseless and rapacious Roman governors who, in those worst days of imperial degeneracy, were sent rapidly in succession to subdue the turbulent and rebellious spirit of the Jews, seemed to vie with each other in exceeding their predecessors in rapacity and cruelty. The patience of God with the obstinate infidelity and wickedness of the people of his ancient choice was nearly exhausted, and they had filled the cup of vengeance which was speedily to be poured out upon them. "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh," says the Apostle, "the judge standeth before the door. Take, my brethren, the prophets who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience." He saw that this terrible storm of persecution, from which the Christians did not escape, was making "the love of many to wax cold." Error was insidiously creeping into the church, and the doctrine of the free grace of the Gospel was already abused by heretics, who taught that holiness and good works were not necessary to salvation. Corruption of manners was the necessary consequence, and the holy Apostle observed with grief that men sinned more recklessly, because they had perversely persuaded themselves that the grace of God was inexhaustible, and more willing to save the chief of sinners than to reward the most patient and humble of saints. The tendency of this Epistle is altogether practical. It inculcates the absolute necessity of holiness and active obedience as the essential proof and only

true fruit of a real and living faith. It, therefore, little deserved the neglect of some of the ancient fathers, or the ill-judged contempt of Luther, who calls it a "chaffy epistle" (*epistola straminea*).

The justice as well as severity of his censures upon the abandoned wickedness of the Jews, which he no doubt uttered in public, as well as committed to writing, the denunciation of the coming judgments, and the unwearied zeal with which he laboured in the cause of Christian truth, excited the relentless malice of the bigoted priests against him. Annas, or Ananus, of the unprincipled and cruel sect of the Sadducees, was then high priest. We learn from Eusebius that both they and the Pharisees had been grievously disappointed by the escape of Paul from their hands, who had lately appealed against their unjust administration of law to the heathen tribunal of the brutal Nero. Albinus, the successor of Festus, had not arrived, and they resolved to sacrifice their victim before any interference of more impartial heathen justice. A council was hastily summoned, James with some others was accused, and summarily condemned as a violator of the Mosaic Law. Judging of him by their own principles and practice, they endeavoured to persuade him to recant, and declare to the people that Jesus was a deceiver. It was the great festival of the Passover, when multitudes filled the courts of the Temple. They induced him to ascend its lofty battlements, and in the presence and hearing of the assembled nation to declare what was the doctrine of the crucified Jesus, hoping that the promise of pardon would prevail upon him to declare that he and all the Christians were imposed upon. Instead of this he exclaimed, "Why do ye inquire of Jesus the Son of man? He sits in heaven, on the right hand of the Majesty on high, and will come again in the clouds of heaven." The people, who revered the Apostle, sent up a loud shout of "Hosannah to the Son of David," and the disappointed Scribes and Pharisees, exclaiming that James himself was deceived,

and had become an impostor, in a rage cast him down from the battlements to the court below. Though terribly bruised, he was not killed by the fall. He recovered so far as to get upon his knees, and pray for forgiveness to his murderers. This only enraged them the more, and they commenced to stone him to death, when one more *mercifully* cruel than the rest is said to have dashed out his brains with a fuller's club.

This martyrdom happened about A.D. 63, about thirty years after our Lord's ascension. The Apostle is supposed to have been of a great age, but we cannot believe that he was advanced to the age of ninety-six, as Epiphanius reports, else he must have been nearly seventy when he was called to be an Apostle, which cannot be credited. Josephus confesses that he was cut off to the regret and sorrow of all good men, and many of the Jewish writers ascribe the destruction of their nation to the guilt which their rulers incurred by putting to death so just and holy a man. There is a spurious gospel still extant, purporting to have been written by James, but there is no genuine writing of this Apostle except the canonical Epistle from which we have quoted.

JAPHETH, the eldest son of Noah, is mentioned by various mythological authors under the name of JAPETUS, whose residence was in Thessaly, where he became celebrated for his power and violence. As Noah divided the earth between Shem, Ham, and Japheth, so in the ancient mythology Saturn divided the world between his three sons, Jupiter, Pluto, and Neptune, the last of whom is also in some mythologies a memorial of Japheth; and as Neptune presided over the sea, it probably originated from the circumstance that the descendant of Japheth "peopled the isles of the Gentiles, and settled in different countries, each according to his language, family, and people," Gen. x. 5. By the *isles of the Gentiles* the Hebrews understood the islands of the Mediterranean, and those countries which they could only

reach by sea—Spain, France, Italy, and Greece. Japheth had seven sons—Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras, to whom the Septuagint, Eusebius, and St Augustine, add an eighth called Eliza. The descendants of the sons of Japheth possessed all Europe, the islands of the Mediterranean, the whole of Asia Minor, and the northern parts of Asia, which the Scythians anciently inhabited; nor is it improbable that America was peopled by some of them entering that mighty continent by the narrow straits which almost connect it with Asia—at least there is most satisfactory evidence that it was colonized by an Asiatic migration. Noah, in his benediction of Japheth, prophesied concerning him—"God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." This prediction has been remarkably verified, and the *enlargement* of Japheth, which denoted a numerous posterity as well as ample territory, is at once apparent when contrasted with the past history and present condition of the descendants of Shem and Ham.

JEHOAHAZ, also called AHAZIAH, the son and successor of Jehu in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. See AHAZIAH.

JEHOAHAZ, the younger son of the good king Josiah, was raised to the throne of Judah, B. C. 610, when the kingdom was verging towards its fall. He was in his twenty-third year when he was chosen successor to his father, and we are told that "he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his fathers had done." Three months after his accession, Necho returned to Jerusalem from the conquest of Phœnicia, deposed Jehoahaz, sent him a captive to Riblath in the Land of Hamath, and "put the land to tribute," or "set a mulct upon the land," according to the marginal reading, "of an hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold." From the smallness of the tribute or contribution, it is evident that the kingdom of Judah had sunk very low. Necho took Jehoahaz with him to Egypt, where

he died, and placed Eliakim, the elder son of Josiah, on the throne, to whom he gave the name of

JEHOIAKIM, who proved himself an unworthy son of that good king, and was in reality, as he is represented by the Prophet Jeremiah, one of the worst sovereigns who occupied the throne of David. He reigned eleven years, from B.C. 611 to B.C. 600. In the third year after the battle of Megiddo, Necho undertook a second expedition against Nabopolassar, who is supposed to be Nebuchadnezzar I., at the head of a numerous army drawn chiefly from Western Africa, Libya, and Ethiopia. Nabopolassar being old and infirm, gave the command of his army to his son, the celebrated Nebuchadnezzar II., who defeated the Egyptian army at Carchemish, otherwise Circesium, on the Euphrates, and drove Necho out of Asia. The Babylonian conqueror marched directly to Jerusalem, then under the sovereignty of Egypt. Jehoiakim after a short siege surrendered, and was again placed on the throne by Nebuchadnezzar, who, however, took part of the ornaments of the Temple with him as plunder, and carried to Babylon several young men, the sons of the principal Hebrews, among whom were Daniel and his three friends, to be employed in the service of his court, and to answer as hostages. In this instance the prediction announced to Hezekiah by Isaiah more than a hundred years previous received a farther accomplishment.

The Babylonian sovereignty over Judah, otherwise the Babylonian captivity, which, according to Jeremiah, was to endure seventy years, commenced in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, Jer. xxv. 1; xlv. 2. In the Book of Daniel (i. 1) it is said to be the third year, but this apparent mistake arises simply from a different mode of computation. Three years afterwards Jehoiakim, probably relying on assistance promised him from Egypt, rebelled against Babylon. In the Second Book of Kings it is said that "the Lord sent against him bands of the Chaldeans, and of the Syrians, and bands of the

Moabites, and bands of the children of Ammon, and sent them against Judah to destroy it, according to the word of the Lord, which he spake by his servants the prophets;" but in the parallel account in the Second Book of the Chronicles nothing is said of this rebellion, it being merely mentioned that Nebuchadnezzar came against King Jehoiakim, bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon. "It is plain," says a writer, "that some gross error has crept into the Book of Chronicles by means of transcribers. Probably Jehoiakim held out against Nebuchadnezzar till the eleventh year of his reign—that he then died, and while yet unburied his son Jehoiachin, who had administered the government during his illness, surrendered—and that the Chaldeans dragged the dead body of the perjured Jehoiakim before the city, and suffered it to lie there unburied."

JEHOIAKIN, or JEHOIACHIN, also called JECONIAH, the son of Jehoiakim, retained possession of the throne of Judah only three months. In the Second Book of Kings (xxiv. 8) we are told that he was eighteen years old when he succeeded his father, whereas in the parallel account (2 Chron. xxxvi. 9) it is stated that he was only eight years old when he began to reign. Stackhouse very appropriately observes that the two passages may be easily reconciled, like many other similar discrepancies, by supposing that his father for political reasons took him to reign together with himself, and that for the first ten years out of the eighteen he was associated in the government. He surrendered to the Chaldeans who then besieged Jerusalem, and was detained a close prisoner. The money of the royal treasury, and the golden utensils of the Temple furnished by Solomon, were sent to Babylon, and an immense number of persons of all ranks, including Jehoiachin, were carried captives to the river Chebar in Mesopotamia, leaving behind only the lower classes of citizens and the peasantry. The Prophet Ezekiel was among the captives. Nebuchadnezzar placed Mattaniah, a brother

of Jehoiaikim, and uncle of the deposed king, upon the throne, giving him the name of Zedekiah.

JEHORAM, or **JORAM**, the son and successor of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, was admitted to a participation of his father's throne, B.C. 891. He was then thirty-two years old, and he reigned eight years. We are told that "he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife; and he did evil in the sight of the Lord." This daughter of Ahab married to Jehoram was Athaliah, and the unhappy consequences of that union soon became visible. All the king's brothers were put to death, supposed to have been done by her influence, and idolatry was introduced. The Edomites revolted, and, although they were once defeated by Jehoram, they succeeded in making themselves independent, and thus fulfilled the prophecy of Isaac, Gen. xxvii. 40. The Philistines also rebelled, and, with the Arabs who bordered on the Cushites, made an incursion into Judah, and plundered Jerusalem and the whole country. They carried into captivity all the king's sons, except Ahaziah, and all the women of the household. Even Libnah, the city of the priests, renounced allegiance to Jehoram because he had forsaken the God of his fathers. He died miserably, and was denied the honours of a royal burial. He was interred in the city of David, but not in the sepulchre of the kings.

JEHORAM, the second son of Ahab, king of Israel, reigned twelve years, from B.C. 896 to 884. The prophecies and miracles of Elijah had induced him to acknowledge the true God. He indeed allowed the golden calves to remain, made no attempt to abolish idolatry, and even left undisturbed the temple of Baal at Samaria, probably because he dreaded the power of his mother Jezebel, but he took away the idolatrous image of Baal which his father had made. The Prophet Elisha always found ready access to Jehoram, and gave him many excellent and salutary counsels, by following

which he gained several advantages over the Syrians, with whom the Ten Tribes had been at war since the reign of Omri. Jehoram also gained an important victory over the Moabites, who had revolted in the reign of his father, and had made themselves independent in the reign of his brother Ahaziah. Nevertheless idolatry still continued, and even a famine of seven years, which compelled many to emigrate, produced no reformation. At length Jehu executed the sentence pronounced against the house of Ahab, and extirpated his whole family. Jehoram was wounded in an expedition against Hazael, and was killed at his summer residence at Jezreel, with his relative Ahaziah, otherwise Jehoiahaz, B.C. 884.

JEHOSHAPHAT, the son and successor of Asa, king of Judah, succeeded his father in the fourth year of Ahab, king of Israel, and reigned twenty-five years, to B.C. 891. He was still more faithful to Jehovah than his father Asa, and "the Lord was with him, because he walked in the first ways of his father David, and sought not unto Baalim; but sought to the Lord God of his fathers, and walked in his commandments, and not after the doings of Israel. Therefore the Lord established the kingdom in his hand, and all Judah brought to Jehoshaphat presents, and he had riches and honour in abundance. And his heart was lifted up in the ways of the Lord; moreover, he took away the high places and groves out of Judah." To attain more effectually the establishment of the true religion, and to root out idolatry and error, he sent out priests and Levites to all his chief towns, to read and teach the Law of God to the people, and he appointed some of his *princes* or magistrates to see it regularly done. He even travelled himself throughout his kingdom, to ascertain in what manner his orders were executed. Those teachers he raised to the rank of royal counsellors, to increase their authority with the people. He improved the administration of justice, and brought his military affairs to a prosperous condition.

It is refreshing to find such a king as Jehoshaphat, when perusing the account of the idolatrous sovereigns, both of Judah and Israel. He loved the Law of God, and consequently experienced the Divine favour and protection. The effects of his judicious government speedily became apparent in the prosperity and number of his people, whom he ruled on the principles of the strictest equity. He was soon able to bring into the field a well disciplined army of no less than one million and sixty thousand men—an immense force for the limited kingdom of Judah and its dependencies; but among these are probably to be included his tributaries the Edomites, the Philistines, and many Arab tribes, who acknowledged his authority. So prosperous was his reign that “the fear of the Lord fell upon all the kingdoms of the lands that were round about Judah, so that they made no war against Jehoshaphat.” He “waxed great exceedingly, and he built in Judah castles (or *palaces*) and cities of store.”

But although Jehoshaphat was thus powerful he was disposed to peace, and ratified the first treaty between Judah and the revolted Ten Tribes. He visited Ahab at Samaria, and was persuaded to join him in an expedition against the Syrians. His conduct in this respect was censured by the Prophet Jehu, the son of Hanani, and as the enterprise proved unsuccessful, it tended to lower Jehoshaphat considerably in the estimation of the surrounding nations. The Ammonites and Moabites took advantage of this apparent revulsion, and pressed into Judah by the way of Edom. Jehoshaphat defeated them in conjunction with Jehoram, king of Israel, but the victory was altogether the work of Divine Providence, and the reward of his fidelity to Jehovah. The Lord “set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, which were come against Judah, and they were smitten.” The passage intimates that the ambushments which the Syrians had laid against Judah, by a confusion among themselves, caused

them, by the interposition of God, to fall upon a part of their own army, mistaking them for the enemy. Jehoshaphat returned to Jerusalem after this victory with immense spoil, which occupied his soldiers three days in gathering, and his “realm was quiet, for God gave him rest round about.”

Jehoshaphat attempted to revive the navigation of the Red Sea, and though he was unsuccessful he seems never to have relinquished the enterprise. An alliance which he formed at this time with the king of Israel was censured by Eliezer, the son of Dodavah of Mareshah, who told him that because he had joined himself to Ahaziah, “the Lord had broken his works; and the ships were broken, that they were not able to go to Tarshish.” He formed a connection with the idolatrous family of Ahab, by allowing his son and successor Jehoram to marry Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, which caused much commotion and bloodshed. Jehoshaphat had six sons besides Jehoram, to all of whom he “gave great gifts of silver, and of gold, and of precious things, with fenced cities in Judah, but the kingdom gave he to Jehoram, because he was the first-born”—namely, he associated him with himself in the government. This excellent prince died in peace, B.C. 891.

JEHOSHUA. See JOSHUA.

JEHU, the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi, a celebrated king of the Ten Tribes, who was one of the chief commanders during the reign of Jehoram the son of Ahab, and brother of Ahaziah. The Prophet Elisha sent one of his disciples to anoint him king when he was at Ramoth-Gilead, and to commission him to execute the sentence pronounced against Ahab. When the messenger arrived he found the captains in consultation, and he intimated to Jehu that he had a particular command for him. He followed the young prophet into an apartment, and was there anointed, and received the Divine injunction which he was called upon rigidly to fulfil—“Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I have anointed thee king over the people of the

Lord, even over Israel. And thou shalt smite the house of Ahab thy master, that I may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of the Lord, at the hand of Jezebel." The prophet immediately fled.

The appearance and dress of the messenger had attracted the notice of the captains, who, when Jehu returned, asked him, "Wherefore came this mad fellow to thee?" He answered that they knew the man, and the nature of his communication. This they positively denied, and insisted that he should tell them. Jehu replied—"Thus and thus spake he to me, saying, Thus saith the Lord, I have anointed thee king over Israel." They immediately took "every man his garment, and put it under him on the top of the stairs, and blew with trumpets, saying, Jehu is king." From the account of the transaction, the captains were probably assembled in the state-room of some building, and when Jehu returned to his associates, and declared to them the prophetic message, they conducted him to the top of the stairs leading to the roof, which was the most conspicuous part of an Oriental structure, being at the very top of the building over the gate, and in full view of the people and the soldiers in the open ground beneath.

Jehu issued a peremptory order, prohibiting any person to leave Ramoth-Gilead and intimate the revolt in Jezreel, where Jehoram lay severely wounded by his conflict with Hazael, king of Syria. Thither Jehu soon proceeded to execute the command of Jehovah. It happened that Ahaziah, king of Judah, a descendant of Ahab by the female line, went to see his wounded relative at Jezreel—a visit which made him also participate in the doom of Ahab's house. It appears that in those ancient times watchmen were set on high places in time of peace as well as of war wherever the king was, that he might not be surprised. An officer of this description perceived the armed company of Jehu approaching, most of them, and certainly their leader, in armed chariots, and communicated the

circumstance to the king, though they were as yet too far distant to enable him to recognize them. Jehoram ordered him to send a horseman to meet and to inquire if they came peacefully. The messenger met them, and demanded—"Thus saith the king, Is it peace?" Jehu replied, "What hast thou to do with peace? turn thee behind me." This abrupt command intimated that the messenger was to ask no questions, nor was he to be allowed to carry any answer back. A second horseman, dispatched to make a similar inquiry, was in like manner detained. By this time the watchman, who had carefully noticed the whole proceedings, informed the king that the "driving is like the driving of Jehu, the son of Nimshi, for he driveth furiously." It appears that Jehoram's suspicions were instantly roused, for he ordered his chariot to be got ready, and he went to meet Jehu, accompanied by Ahaziah, in the "portion" of Naboth the Jezreelite, the special Providence of God bringing them to the very place which Ahab had obtained in the most guilty manner, and which had occasioned the malediction pronounced against him and his family.

When Jehoram saw his former captain, he exclaimed, "Is it peace, Jehu?" The threatening appearance of Jehu's followers plainly intimated violence, yet he wished to ascertain from their leader the real purport of their extraordinary and unexpected expedition to Jezreel; or probably the question might have had some reference to the Syrian war, which Jehu and the other captains were conducting. Jehoram was soon informed of their hostile intentions. Jehu answered—"What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?" He upbraided Jehoram with his mother's abominable idolatries and superstitions, not with his own, because hers were the most notorious and infamous, and the origin of all the others, which he imitated and practised, and because they were to be punished by Jehu himself, who was commissioned to

execute the Divine judgments. Jehoram instantly turned and fled, exclaiming to the king of Judah, "There is treachery, O Ahaziah;" but Jehu pierced him with an arrow, and he sunk mortally wounded in his chariot. "Take up," said Jehu to Bidkar his captain, "and cast him in the portion of the field of Naboth the Jezreelite, for remember how that when I and thou rode together after Ahab his father, the Lord laid this burden upon him; Surely I have seen yesterday the blood of Naboth, and the blood of his sons, saith the Lord; and I will requite thee in this plat (portion), saith the Lord. Now, therefore, take and cast him into the plat of ground, according to the word of the Lord." Jehu here refers to the time when he rode with the rest of Ahab's guard, and when that impious king went to take possession of Naboth's inheritance. In the Hebrew the passage is strictly—"Remember, thou and I were amongst those who rode two and two together with Ahab;" which intimates that Ahab was attended on that occasion by his guard, who rode two and two, and Jehu and Bidkar, riding together at that time, heard Elijah's words, in which the Lord laid this "burden," or punishment, upon him. The words of Elijah cited by Jehu are not recorded in the other passage, 1 Kings xxi. 19, but the Prophet might have said more than is there recorded, which Jehu remembered. It thus appears that it was not chance, but the overruling power of Heaven, which directed this remarkable transaction, and conducted Joram to the very place which had been decreed to be the place of his death. The purchase of Ahab's covetousness and murder was the scene of his punishment, and of his son's death.

When Ahaziah, king of Judah, saw the fate of Jehoram, he attempted to escape by the garden gate of the palace, but Jehu commanded his soldiers to pursue him, and they severely wounded him. In the Second Book of Kings (ix. 28) it is said that he fled to Megiddo, and died there, but in the parallel passage (2 Chron.

xxii. 9), it appears that being sought for and taken in Samaria, he was brought to Jehu probably at Jezreel, who commanded him to be put to death.

The arrival of Jehu at Jezreel and his proceedings were soon made known to Jezebel the queen-mother, who "painted her face (or *put her eyes in painting*), and tired her head." This custom is still universal among the ladies of the East, who, by a very delicate operation, tinge their eyelids with a metallic black powder. The case of Jezebel is the earliest existing notice of this custom. She had no intention of tempting Jehu by her beauty, and she appears to have been actuated by motives of pride and vanity to keep up her state and dignity to the last. In this condition she looked out of a window when Jehu entered the gate of Jezreel, and in the last action of her life she exhibited her haughty and inflexible spirit. With the utmost composure and deliberation she adorned her person as if on an occasion of state, and instead of seeking concealment or flight, or proposing terms, she proudly encountered the successful rebel with reproaches—"Had Zimri peace," she sarcastically asked Jehu and his followers, "who slew his master?" Jehu looked up, and exclaimed, "Who is on my side, who?" There looked out two or three eunuchs, whom he commanded to throw her out of the window. They obeyed, and the blood of the haughty Sidonian princess "was sprinkled on the wall, and on the horses, and he trode her under foot." In this condition she was left dead on the street, until Jehu gave orders to bury her, but when his servants went for that purpose they found no more of her than the skull and the palms of her hands. Such was the end of Jezebel—a queen whose name has become proverbial for wickedness and impiety. "The dogs," says Bishop Hall, "have prevented Jehu in his purpose, and have given to Jezebel a living tomb more ignoble than the worst of the earth. Only the skull, hands, and feet, of that vanished carcass yet remain—the skull, which was the roof of all her

wicked devices—the hands and feet, which were the executioners. Thus Jezebel is become food for dogs. Elijah is verified, Naboth is revenged, Jezreel is purged, Jehu is zealous, and, in all, God is just.”

But the divine vengeance against the guilty Ahab was not yet fulfilled. We are told that he “had seventy sons in Samaria,” which probably includes grandsons, according to the usual phraseology of Scripture. When the leading men at the court at Jezreel heard that Jehoram was slain, and being ignorant that Jehu had been anointed king, they fled with those princes to Samaria the capital, and the strongest place in the kingdom, afraid that they might fall into the avenger’s hands, and thus the succession to the crown would be destroyed. Jehu accordingly wrote letters to the “rulers of Jezreel” who were then at Samaria, exhorting them to select the best and the worthiest of their late master’s sons, and set him on his father’s throne, intimating at the same time that they would be expected to be ready to defend his right. But the character of Jehu was well known, and his proposal threw them into terror and perplexity. They said—“Behold, two kings stood not before him; how then shall we stand?” Judging it safer to acknowledge the authority of Jehu, they announced to him—“We are thy servants, and will do all that thou shalt bid us: we will not make any king; do thou that which is good in thine eyes.” Jehu proposed a proof of the sincerity of their declaration.—“If ye be mine, and if ye will hearken unto my voice, take ye the heads of the men your master’s sons, and come to me to Jezreel by to-morrow at this time.” This order was literally obeyed—the seventy princes were beheaded, and their heads sent to Jehu, and he ordered them to be laid “in two heaps at the entrance of the gate of Jezreel.” The horrid usages here mentioned have always prevailed throughout Asia, where heads have been invariably regarded as the best trophies of victory. Jehu surveyed them without the slightest emo-

tion, and commenced an address to the people, in which he told them that they ought not to impute the destruction of Ahab’s family to him, as if it had proceeded from his own private revenge or ambition, seeing that the leading men in the kingdom were as unanimous for it as himself, and that therefore they should esteem it the special work of Divine Providence, in conformity to the severe threats they had heard denounced against that wicked house by the Prophet Elijah. After this Jehu “slew all the house of Ahab in Jezreel, and all his great men, and all his kinsfolk (or acquaintance), and his priests, until he left none remaining.” On his way to Samaria he met some of the kinsmen of the deceased king Ahaziah of Judah, and related to the house of Ahab by the unhappy alliance of the son of Jehoshaphat with Athaliah. The whole of them, forty-two in number, were put to death. It was another remarkable act of Divine Providence that these kinsmen of Ahaziah should have fallen in Jehu’s way, and be ignorant of the fate of those they were going to salute at this critical juncture, but it was evidently ordered that all who bore any affinity to Ahab should be gathered together, and experience the common fate of that doomed family.

After this transaction we find Jehu meeting Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, a descendant of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, mentioned by the Prophet Jeremiah. The respect which Jehu rendered to Jehonadab, and the particular regard he paid to his approbation of the measures he was taking to extirpate idolatry, shows the character of the latter, who had come to congratulate the new king on his happiness in fulfilling the commands of God, and to encourage him in his proceedings for the re-establishment of the worship of Jehovah.

Jehu, having thus extirpated the family of Ahab, became king of the Ten Tribes, B.C. 884, and reigned twenty-eight years. He entirely abolished idolatry, put to the sword the idolatrous priests and prophets of Baal at a festival, as traitors to

Jehovah, and turned the temple of Baal into a draught-house. Nevertheless he suffered the golden calves to remain, and he thus sanctioned the schism which Jeroboam had introduced for the same political reasons—he allowed the worship of the calves lest it might prove dangerous to his kingdom if his subjects were allowed to proceed to Jerusalem. “Here,” it is appropriately observed, “the motives which influenced Jehu stand displayed. Though raised to the throne by the hand of God, he now looked for the security of it to his own policy. Destitute of faith in Him to whom he was indebted for all, he trusted not to the King of kings for the permanence of the gifts he bestowed. Destitute of gratitude to his gracious Benefactor, he returned for unmerited kindness habitual and presumptuous disobedience. While regard to the commandments of God conducted him in the path of advancement, he was eager to obey; but now, to his worldly apprehension obedience and interest ceased to coincide. He who had been exalted to sovereign power for the express purpose of annihilating idolaters, converted his authority and example into instruments of upholding and perpetuating idolatry among his subjects. During a reign of twenty-eight years, unmoved by the judicial calamities with which the Lord had *cut Israel short*, this obdurate monarch bowed down, together with his people, before the images erected in violation of God’s commands, before altars reared in express opposition to His holy Temple.” The idolatry introduced by Ahab and Jezebel was thus not annihilated even by Jehu’s first coercive measures. Although no longer upheld by royal authority, many still practised it, on which account the territory east of the Jordan fell into the hands of the Syrians, and those countries which were the first conquered by the Israelites were the first that they lost. For his services Jehu received a promise that his descendants for four generations should possess the throne. He was buried in Samaria, and was succeeded by his son Jehoahaz.

JEPHTHAH, one of the judges of Israel, flourished about B.C. 1161–1143. His father’s name was Gilead, and his mother was a strange woman, or concubine wife, of a different nation. At his father’s marriage Jephthah was expelled by the family, and he retired to the country of Tob, where he became the leader of a band of adventurers, as he had no inheritance or connections to afford him a subsistence. This is what the inspired historian means when he tells us that “there were gathered vain men to Jephthah, and went out with him.” He carried on a kind of military robbery, particularly against the Ammonites, to retaliate the incursions which they made upon the Israelites, and this mode of life was never considered dishonourable in the East. The Israelites who dwelt beyond the Jordan, being greatly harassed by the Ammonites, applied to Jephthah for assistance, who, after reproving the elders of Gilead for their harsh treatment of him when expelled from his father’s house, consented to be their leader. He did this, however, on certain conditions. Among the Jews, if persons of a foreign nation embraced the Law, their children were held as true Hebrews, and hence the complaint of Jephthah on the injustice of his expulsion. He said to the elders of Gilead who came to him in Tob—“Did not ye hate me, and expel me out of my father’s house, and why are ye come to me now when ye are in distress?” The elders replied—“Therefore we turn again to thee now, that thou mayest go with us, and fight against the children of Ammon, and be our head over all the inhabitants of Gilead.” Jephthah then proposed to them—“If ye bring me home again to fight against the children of Ammon, and the Lord deliver them before me, shall I be your head?” The elders solemnly swore to observe this stipulation—“The Lord be witness between us, if we do not so according to thy words.” Thus elected their chief, Jephthah “uttered all his words before the Lord in Mizpeh,” which intimates that he laid before God, in a solemn address

or prayer, all that had passed between him and the elders of Gilead, imploring the Divine approbation and protection.

Being invested with the chief command, Jephthah, though a "mighty man of valour," remonstrated with the king of the nomade Ammonites on the injustice of the war in which he was engaged, and, as he received no satisfactory reply, he levied a powerful army and marched against him. Before he engaged he made the celebrated vow, concerning which volumes have been written, that if he was victorious he would sacrifice or consecrate to God the first living creature that should come out of his house to meet him on his return. The contest was soon decided by a complete victory, and when Jephthah returned a conqueror to his residence at Mizpeh, he perceived his daughter, an only child, coming forward to meet him with music and dancing, and other tokens of affection. He recollected his vow, and exhibited the most poignant distress. He rent his clothes, and said, "Alas, my daughter! thou hast brought me very low, and thou art one of them that trouble me, for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back." She received the intelligence with a firm and submissive mind, and determining to acquiesce in the accomplishment of her father's vow, she merely requested a delay of two months, that she might retire with her companions to lament the condition in which she was placed. At the expiration of the time she returned to her father, "who did with her according to the vow which he had vowed."

Soon after Jephthah had been raised to the dignified station which was the reward of his valour, the Ephraimites became envious of a glory in which they had not been allowed to participate, and combined against him. This contest was soon decided by their entire defeat. The Gileadites, commanded by Jephthah, seized the fords of the Jordan, and put to death all those who attempted to escape into their own country. To distinguish the Ephraimites from the other Israelites who had occasion to cross that

river, he ordered them to pronounce the word *Shibboleth*, signifying *an ear of corn*, or *current of water*, which the people of Ephraim, having a pronunciation different from the other tribes, were accustomed to call *sibboleth*, being unable to pronounce the Hebrew letter *schin*. Accordingly, as many as were detected by this test were put to death without mercy. The number of the Ephraimites who were killed by their own headstrong folly in quarrelling with Jephthah on this occasion amounted to forty-two thousand. After this event nothing more is known of Jephthah except that he judged Israel, or perhaps only the two and a half tribes beyond the Jordan, six years, and died B.C. 1137. He was buried in one of the cities of Gilead not mentioned.

The vow made by Jephthah has caused an immense controversy—the point being to determine whether he really did sacrifice his daughter, or only devoted her to perpetual celibacy as consecrated to Jehovah. As this is a discussion which must ever remain undecided, notwithstanding all the learned ingenuity which has been employed in its elucidation, it would be preposterous in the present work to adopt either view of the question. The few observations, therefore, which follow are to be understood as referring to a few points in this singular controversy, leaving the reader to draw whatever inferences he pleases.

It cannot be denied that the balance of authority, both Jewish and Christian, is in favour of the opinion that Jephthah actually sacrificed his daughter to Jehovah, and the compilers of the Homilies of the Church of England seem to concur in that opinion. It has been argued that this literal interpretation of the narrative is most agreeable to the natural construction of the original Hebrew text—that there is no rule or precedent in the inspired history to justify the practice of devoting females to perpetual virginity, which is contrary to the Mosaic Law—that when Jephthah made this vow he must have expected a human being to come out of his door to meet him, for if

he had intended merely the sacrifice of a bullock, there was no necessity for such a solemn vow, and he would rather have vowed the offering of hecatombs than of a single animal on an occasion so important. Besides, the sacred writer informs us that it was a "custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah four days in a year," and this, it is contended, was evidently an annual rite, and cannot be understood as simply intimating that they went on those occasions as long as she lived to talk with her, and to console her for the condition into which she had been placed by her father's vow. It is farther maintained, that as Jephthah had previous to this transaction led a bold and daring life, which procured for him the reputation of being a "mighty man of valour"—as he had been enabled when a fugitive to collect a troop of "vain men," whom he formed into a band of predatory adventurers, and became their leader—as he was brought up beyond the Jordan, where the connection with the tabernacle and its ordinances was very loose, and where the ephod of Gideon had been a snare to the people—as it is possible that the Hebrews during their idolatry had offered human sacrifices, in imitation of their neighbours who certainly did so—and as Jephthah might consider that such sacrifices were acceptable to the gods, mingled with a confused and misunderstood recollection of Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac—on these and similar considerations there is nothing very violent in the notion that he may have contemplated the possibility of such a sacrifice, though certainly not of his own daughter, when pronouncing his vow, and it is not to be supposed that the Law was very distinctly known to a man who had led such a life as the brave Gileadite.

These are a few of the principal arguments for the literal interpretation of the transaction, that Jephthah did actually sacrifice his daughter. But, on the other hand, very powerful objections have been urged against these views. It is said

that after she returned from "bemoaning her virginity," he "did with her according to his vow," but it is not said what he did with her, and the circumstance that she is not noticed as having been sacrificed is considered good evidence that she was not so devoted. The inspired writer, in mentioning the distress of Jephthah, tells us that his daughter was his "only child," and this is considered as a cause, besides his parental affection, for his excessive grief; but we have repeated intimations in the Scriptures that the Hebrews were most intensely anxious for posterity, and as Jephthah could only hope for descendants to perpetuate his name and family through his daughter, his grief was natural, without connecting it with the harsher interpretation of the vow. And as to the yearly *lamenting* of the "daughters of Israel" for the daughter of Jephthah, it was undoubtedly, as it still is, a custom universal in the East for persons to go once a year to lament over the graves of their deceased friends. This fact seems to favour the idea that the daughter of Jephthah really died, but it has been strongly urged that much of the sense of the whole narrative depends on the interpretation of the word rendered *to lament* in our version, and it is therefore understood differently, according to the opinions entertained. The proper interpretation of the word is *to praise* or *celebrate*, and we may understand it as denoting that the daughters of Israel kept this anniversary to commemorate the transaction, whatever were its results.

But the strongest objection to the literal interpretation of Jephthah's vow is, that if he really did consummate the sacrifice of his daughter, it was decidedly against the Law of Jehovah, and could not have been done at His altar, by His high priest, or by any regular and faithful member of the priesthood. "That Jephthah," says Dr Hales, "could not possibly sacrifice his daughter, according to the vulgar opinion founded on incorrect translation, may appear from the following consider-

ations among others :—1. The sacrifice of children to Moloch was an abomination to the Lord, of which in numberless passages He expresses His detestation, and it was also prohibited by an express law under pain of death, Lev. xx. 2, 3. And, 2. No father merely by his own authority could put an offending, much less an innocent, child to death upon any account, without the sentence of the magistrates and the consent of the people,” Dent. xxi. 18–21. The character of Jephthah is also considered by those who adopt the interpretation that his daughter was devoted to perpetual virginity. It is contended that he was not the wild and daring adventurer which his predatory life in the desert would lead us to infer—that as a judge of the Hebrews his whole conduct intimates that he was under the influence of religious feeling, more especially as his name is associated with other ancient worthies enumerated by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as illustrious instances of the power of faith. Consequently, as Jephthah could not be ignorant that a vow which involved the contingency of sacrificing his own daughter could not be lawful, particularly as human sacrifices are again and again interdicted with the strongest expressions of abhorrence and reprobation, the opposing supposition is that she was devoted to the Lord, and therefore doomed to perpetual celibacy. But even this conclusion is beset with difficulties. It is true that there was nothing to prevent human beings being consecrated to God and the service of His tabernacle. Samuel was devoted from his birth, and in the division of the spoils in the first Midianitish war, it is said that the *Lord's tribute* from the whole number of captive virgins was *thirty-five*. Nevertheless, whatever may have been the fate of Jephthah's daughter, it is well known that those persons who were devoted to God were not doomed to perpetual celibacy. Samuel, who was so devoted before he was born, was married and had sons. Of female devotement among the Hebrews we have no instance except the

one before us, if it be really one, and it is difficult to ascertain in what respect under their Law a woman could be consecrated to Jehovah, or what services she could perform when so consecrated. There is nothing in the Scriptures to sanction the practice of female celibacy on religious grounds, such as those maintained by the Roman Catholic Church, and nothing to denote that it existed in Israel either before or after Jephthah's time. As to the thirty-five Midianitish virgins already mentioned, who became the *Lord's tribute*, they were captives taken in war, and could not possibly be connected with any vow of religious devotement. It is understood that they were given to the Levites as female slaves, whom they might employ as such in ordinary services, and it is not improbable that the Levites often received female captives taken in war for such occupations—an inference evidently justified from the manner in which they are noticed, for it is nowhere said that those Midianitish young women remained in a state of celibacy, or that they had any particular duties to perform.

Dr Waterland observes—“What is most probable is, that Jephthah did not sacrifice his daughter, nor intend any such thing.” However this may be, it must be held that such an offering could not be made upon God's sacred altar. Farther than this the subject is difficult and obscure, and though it has caused an almost interminable controversy, it is almost needless to observe that the conclusions are still uncertain. Although no great weight can be attached to the arguments alleged in vindication of Jephthah, and although his vow must always be considered as rash and unguarded, the more favourable view of the transaction is that which seems to be now generally adopted. In the spirit of this interpretation Dr Randolph has the following practical observations :—“From this history of Jephthah's vow we should be led to imitate the faith, the piety, the strict sense of honour and religion, so eminently conspicuous in Jephthah and

his daughter. As, on the one hand, we should be cautious how we make rash vows, which may involve us in difficulty and perplexity, so, on the other hand, let us neither seek nor admit of any pretences for dispensing with our duty. Let no distresses or difficulties shake our constancy, or prevail with us to go back from the paths of virtue and religion, but let us prefer our duty and our honour to all considerations of interest or affection. Let us ever follow that which is good, abstaining 'from all appearance of evil,' and 'keeping a conscience void of offence towards God and man.'

JEREMIAH, a distinguished Prophet, was the son of Hilkiab, "of the priests that were in Anathoth, in the land of Benjamin"—a city appropriated out of that tribe to the use of the priests and the sons of Aaron (Josh. xxi. 18), and situated a few miles distant from Jerusalem. Some suppose Hilkiab to have been that high priest Hilkiab by whom the book of the Law was found in the Temple in the reign of Josiah, but for this supposition there is no authority except that both were of the same name, which, like several others, was common among the Jews. Jeremiah was called very young to the prophetic office, about the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah, B.C. 628, and continued to discharge it during a period of at least forty-two years. In the course of his ministry he met with so much opposition that all his prophecies are of the melancholy order, and he has been appropriately called the *weeping Prophet*. The persecution and ill usage he experienced from his countrymen of all classes had such an influence on his mind, as to draw from him expressions of bitterness which some have thought scarcely reconcileable with his religious principles, but which, when duly considered, will be found to demand pity for his unmerited sufferings, rather than our censure for any want of reverence towards God. His life was often exposed to danger, and he was committed to prison on account of his remonstrances against the kings of Judah, and

his predictions of the calamities which awaited them, particularly during the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah. Jeremiah appears to have been a Prophet of unblemished piety and conscientious integrity, and a warm lover of his country, the misery of which he pathetically deploras. Soon after the deposition of Jehoiabaz, and the accession of Jehoiakim to the throne, he was commissioned to denounce the Divine vengeance against him and the people, unless they repented of their wickedness. His conduct provoked their indignation, and they accused him as a seditious person who deserved death. He was nevertheless acquitted by the nobles, and by powerful influence he was preserved from the king's vengeance. About four years afterwards we find him predicting the destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem, and the Babylonish Captivity, which he foretold would last seventy years. For this prophecy he was sent to prison, and narrowly escaped with his life.

After the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah was set at liberty by order of the king, and was allowed either to accompany his general Nebuzaradan to Babylon, or to remain in Judah with Gedaliah, who was appointed governor of the miserable remnant of the people left in that country. He was so affectionately attached to his countrymen, notwithstanding their injurious treatment of him, that he chose the latter alternative rather than enjoy a state of ease which the favour of the king of Babylon would have secured for him. He went to reside with Gedaliah at Mizpah, and after the assassination of that officer he was carried into Egypt, with those Jews who resolved contrary to his advice to retire thither. Of the subsequent events of his life there is no authentic account. Some of the Rabbins allege that he returned to Judea, and others say that he went to Babylon, where he died. Jerome and several others record a tradition that he was stoned to death by the Jews at Tahpanhes in Egypt, for undauntedly remonstrating

against their idolatrous practices, and foretelling the consequences which would inevitably follow. This account of his death, from the temper and disposition of the parties concerned, is at least probable. Some incline to the opinion that he died in Egypt at an advanced age, in great affliction at the calamities which had befallen his country.

Jerome characterizes the style of Jeremiah as "retaining something of the rusticity of the village where he was born;" but this opinion is controverted by Bishop Lowth, who thus eloquently delineates the merits of Jeremiah as a writer.—"Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, as far as relates to style, may be said to hold the same rank among the Hebrews as Homer, Simonides, and Eschylus, among the Greeks—Jeremiah, though deficient neither in elegance nor sublimity, must give place in both to Isaiah. Jerome seems to object against him a sort of rusticity of language, no vestige of which, I must however confess, I have been able to discover. His sentiments, it is true, are not always the most elevated, nor are his periods always neat and compact; but these are faults common to these writers whose principal aim is to excite the gentle affections, and to call forth the tear of sympathy or sorrow. This observation is very strongly exemplified in the Lamentations, where these are the prevailing passions: it is, however, frequently exemplified in the Prophecies of this author, and most of all in the beginning of the Book (ix. xiv. xx. &c.), which is chiefly poetical. The middle of it is almost entirely historical. The latter part, again, consisting of the six last chapters, is altogether poetical; it contains several different predictions, which are distinctly marked, and in these the Prophet approaches very near the sublimity of Isaiah. On the whole, I can scarcely pronounce above half of the Book of Jeremiah to be poetical."

The small book called the Lamentations of Jeremiah, which follows his Prophecies, was not written by him till after the destruction of the city and

Temple of Jerusalem, and the depopulation of the country—events alluded to and bewailed as what had been already fully accomplished. In the opinion of Dr Blair, "perhaps the most perfect and regular elegiac composition in the world is the Lamentations of Jeremiah."—"The Prophet's peculiar talent," says Dr Blaney, "lay in working up and expressing the passions of grief and pity, and unhappily for him, as a man and a citizen, he met with a subject too well calculated to give his genius its full display."

JEROBOAM, the son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim, was the first king of the Ten Tribes after the revolt at the accession of Rehoboam. During the reign of Solomon, the Prophet Ahijah foretold that Jeroboam would reign over ten tribes, an intimation which he seems to have acted upon too prematurely, for we find him soon afterwards engaging in treasonable practices, and compelled to flee into Egypt, the common resort at that time of all disaffected Hebrews. At the death of Solomon, Rehoboam listened to the rash advice of his younger courtiers, and threatened the rulers of the tribes with a still more intolerable yoke. Ten of them renounced their allegiance, and elected Jeroboam to be their sovereign. He possessed the cantonnments of those tribes, together with all the tributary nations as far as the Euphrates, and this was now called the kingdom of Israel.

Jeroboam reigned twenty-two years, or to B.C. 954. Rehoboam often determined to reduce him to obedience, and for this purpose he collected troops, but the Prophet Shemaiah announced to him the command of Jehovah to relinquish the attempt. He was reasonable enough to comply with this injunction, but no definite treaty of peace was concluded, and the frontiers of the two kingdoms always presented hostile appearances. Although Jeroboam had received no promise of an eternal kingdom, as had been given to David, yet an assurance was given to him that if he obeyed the Law, the throne should long continue in his

family, 1 Kings xi. 37, 38. But he trusted little to the Divine Promise, and commenced his reign by a policy which eventually proved the ruin of his family. The inspired historian informs us that Jeroboam said in his heart, "Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David; if this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto their lord, even unto Rehoboam, king of Judah, and they shall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam, king of Judah." He foresaw that if the people resorted steadily to Jerusalem, whither the Law obliged them to proceed to attend the appointed service, they would likely repent of the revolt, and return to their allegiance. To prevent this, Jeroboam hazarded a daring innovation of religion. He set up two golden or gilded calves as images of Jehovah—the one at Bethel, not far from Shechem, for the southern tribes, and the other at Dan, for those in the north, and announced to his subjects—"It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem; behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." It is conjectured that Jeroboam made those two calves for idolatrous worship in imitation of the Egyptians, among whom he had lived, whose objects of idolatry were two oxen—the one called Apis at Memphis, the capital of Upper Egypt, and the other called Mnevis at Hierapolis, the chief city of Lower Egypt. It is evident, however, that no apostasy from Jehovah to other gods was immediately intended. His great object was to prevent his subjects going three times a-year to Jerusalem as the Law required, and the golden calves were set up at suitable distances. He probably thought that this was the least offensive contrivance by which his object could be attained; and in that object his successors were also much interested, for they carefully maintained this symbolical mode of worship; and accordingly we read of all of them that they "departed not from the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin."

Having introduced this daring innovation, Jeroboam next "made an house of high places, and made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi." This ought rather to be rendered *any of the people not of the sons of Levi*, or *out of all people*. By the Law none but a Levite of Aaron's family could be a priest, and none but a Levite could assist in the subordinate services of religion; but the priests and Levites refused to participate in Jeroboam's innovations, and he was therefore obliged to appoint persons out of any of the tribes who were willing to accept the office. He also ordered the festivals to be held a month later, and at one of them, the feast of tabernacles, he acted as high priest himself. We never read of a high priest in the kingdom of Israel, and probably no one was found bold enough to assume that office.

Jeroboam received several warnings of the wickedness of his conduct, and on some occasions, especially on that when his arm withered, and was restored by the intercession of a "man of God out of Judah," he became seriously alive to his danger, but these impressions were not permanent, and he "returned not from his evil way, but made again of the lowest of the people priests of the high places; whosoever would he consecrated him, and he became one of the priests of the high places." He soon afterwards received a Divine message respecting the fate of his family. His son Ahijah fell sick, and he said to his wife, "Arise, I pray thee, and disguise thyself, that thou be not known to be the wife of Jeroboam, and get thee to Shiloh; behold, there is Ahijah the prophet, who told me that I should be king over this people—He shall tell thee what shall become of the child." Ahijah was blind from old age, but a communication from Jehovah informed him of the real rank of his intended visitor, and when she appeared, he exclaimed, "Come in, thou wife of Jeroboam, why feignest thou thyself to be another? for I am sent unto thee with heavy tidings." The aged

phet then instructed her what she was to announce to Jeroboam for his ungrateful conduct and idolatry:—"Him that dieth of Jeroboam in the city shall the dogs eat, and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat: for the Lord hath spoken it. Arise thou, therefore, get thee to thine own house, and when thy feet enter into the city the child shall die. And all Israel shall mourn for him, and bury him, for he only of Jeroboam shall come to the grave, because in him there is found some good thing toward the Lord God of Israel in the house of Jeroboam."

In a war with Abijah, the son and successor of Rehoboam, Jeroboam was signally defeated by the interposition of Divine Providence, and lost five hundred thousand men on the field of battle. The victorious king of Judah took several important places from him, and "neither did Jeroboam recover strength again in the days of Abijah." We are also told that "the Lord struck him and he died," 2 Chron. xiii. 20; but in the parallel passage it is simply stated that he "slept with his fathers," 1 Kings xiv. 20. He was succeeded by his son Nadab.

JEROBOAM II., king of Israel, was a son and successor of Joash or Jehoash. He reigned forty-one years, but few particulars of his history are recorded. He recovered from the Syrians all which they had conquered during the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz, and restored the kingdom to its ancient boundaries, as had been predicted by the Prophet Jonah. Jeroboam II. was succeeded by his son Zachariah.

JERUBAAL. See GIDEON.

JESSE, the father of David, was the son of Obed, the son of Boaz and Ruth. He was a native of Bethlehem, and had seven sons besides David, who was the youngest. No particulars are preserved respecting him.

JETHRO, the father-in-law of Moses, called also **REUEL**, the high priest or prince of Midian, whose residence was in the neighbourhood of Mount Horeb, in the peninsula of Sinai. See MOSES.

JEZEBEL, the idolatrous queen of Ahab, was the daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians, or rather of the Tyrians. Her violent, imperious, and ungovernable temper, has made her name proverbial, and her character is admirably illustrated in the affair of Naboth the Jezreelite. Her father Ethbaal is mentioned by Menander under the name of Ithobalus, and as, twenty-one years after his death, his grand-daughter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated commonwealth, we may judge what sort of spirit animated the princesses of his family. We need therefore feel little surprise that Jezebel should have exerted such an influence as she did over Ahab and the kingdom of Israel, and that her daughter Athaliah, the cousin of Dido, afterwards took possession of the throne of Judah. Jezebel survived Ahab some years, and was killed in the extraordinary manner recorded by the sacred historian. See AHAH and JEHU.

JOAB, one of the three sons of Zeruiah, was a distinguished Jewish warrior, and general of David's armies. He appears to have been always faithful to David, and jealous for his prosperity and honour, but he scrupled not to commit the most enormous crimes, which David either had it not in his power or neglected to punish. He treacherously assassinated Abner, the son of Ner, who had slain his brother Asahel, for which he was cursed by David, who on this occasion was forced to confess that though he was anointed king, "these men, the sons of Zeruiah, were too hard for him," and to content himself in the meantime with the assurance that "the Lord would reward the doer of evil according to his wickedness." The life of Joab seems to have been one of unwearying turmoil, activity, and recklessness, never forgiving an injury, and calmly waiting a proper time for revenge. Notwithstanding the express orders of the king, Joab slew Absalom with his own hand, and had even the hardihood to address a severe remonstrance to David for his undue grief on that occasion. He implicated himself with the party who

favoured the pretensions of Adonijah, and incurred the resentment of Solomon on that account, who commanded Benaiah to put him to death, even though he had taken refuge at the altar in the tabernacle. David has been severely censured for his dying advice to Solomon, in which he said respecting Joab, "Do therefore according to thy wisdom, and let not his hoar head go down to the grave in peace." It is doubtless true that Joab had always been faithful to David, and had rendered him many great and valuable services; it is also true that forgiveness of enemies is a duty, and that the manifestation of a vindictive spirit in a dying advice is one of the most lamentable displays of the bad passions of human nature. But in the case of Joab there are certain circumstances which must be taken into account, to explain the conduct of David. That prince was never able during his lifetime to punish Joab for his crimes, and he had been repeatedly exposed to his insolence. He would therefore have been held as sanctioning the murders committed by Joab if he had taken no notice of them on his deathbed, and enjoined his successor to do with him "according to his wisdom," which was not an advice that he should be put absolutely and unconditionally to death, but that, if he should offend again, his previous crimes should be brought against him, and that he should be punished for them also. Joab, at the accession of Solomon, became a dangerous subject, and his intrigues in favour of Adonijah rendered him clearly amenable to the doom of a traitor. No prince is bound to tolerate an implacable and restless enemy to his government, and although David forgave every private injury of which Joab was guilty to him as an individual, he was entitled to advise what was necessary for the public good in the case of those dangerous persons who, notwithstanding the lenity of the government, should be guilty of new offences. When Solomon began to reign, the continuance of peace had impaired the power of Joab, and the king, who had

no reason to dread his influence with the army, was enabled to inflict upon him that punishment which justice demanded.

JOASH, or JEHOASH, king of Judah, was the youngest son of Ahaziah, the son of Jehoram and Athaliah. He was when an infant saved from the vengeance of that princess by Josheba, a sister of Ahaziah, and was privately brought up by a nurse in an apartment of the Temple. In the sixth or seventh year of Athaliah's usurpation of the throne of Judah the young prince, by the management of the high priest Jehoiada, was publicly anointed king in the Temple, under the protection of a strong escort of well armed Levites. Athaliah was at the same time put to death—a fate which her idolatry, cruelty, and violent usurpation deserved. On this occasion the covenant with Jehovah was renewed, and all the people solemnly swore to observe it—a precaution rendered necessary by the long continuance of an idolatrous government.

Joash reigned forty years, and during the life of his guardian, the high priest Jehoiada, his conduct was entirely in accordance with the principles of the Hebrew theocracy. The idolatry introduced by Athaliah was abolished, and the Temple was repaired, the people voluntarily contributing to defray the expense. But after the death of Jehoiada, which took place in his hundredth and thirtieth year, an inclination towards idolatry was again manifested, and some of the principal men of Judah even requested toleration for the worship of idols. Joash was so deluded as to grant their request, and the nation became again infected with superstition and delusion. The Prophet Zechariah, son of the deceased venerable high priest Jehoiada, was enjoined to predict sundry calamities on this account, but Joash most ungratefully ordered him to be stoned in the court of the Temple, although he was the son of a man to whom he was indebted for his life, his education, and his throne, and to whom the nation had awarded a royal burial in

testimony of his services. But this outrageous cruelty and ingratitude did not prevent the fulfilment of the prophecy. The king of Syria marched against Jerusalem with a small body of troops, took possession of the city, put to the sword the rulers who had demanded the toleration of idolatry, and returned to Damascus enriched with spoils. Joash, who had been wounded, was soon afterwards slain by his own servants, to revenge the family of Jehoiada the high priest, and his memory was so detested that he was denied the honours of a royal funeral. He was succeeded by his son Amaziah.

JOASH, the grandson of Jehu, king of Israel, succeeded his father Jehoahaz in the year B.C. 841, and reigned sixteen or seventeen years. Although it is said of Joash that "he did evil in the sight of the Lord," and "departed not from all the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin, but walked therein," it is evident that he paid some respect to the worship of Jehovah, or at least was not a promoter of idolatry, from the respect in which he held the Prophet Elisha, whom he visited when he "was fallen sick of the sickness whereof he died." On that melancholy occasion he exclaimed, in the well known watchword first uttered by the Prophet himself concerning Elijah when he was taken up to heaven, "O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." This was evidently in reference to the Syrians, whom he was able to hold in check, and eventually to gain the ascendancy over them. The Prophet said to the king, "Take bow and arrows—put thine hand upon the bow." Joash did so, and he was directed by Elisha to open the window eastward, and shoot the arrow. When he had so done, the Prophet said—"The arrow of the Lord's deliverance, and the arrow of deliverance from Syria; for thou shalt smite the Syrians in Aphek till thou have consumed them." He was directed to strike upon the ground, which he did three times, and then voluntarily stopped,

which elicited a severe reproof from Elisha:—"Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times, then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it; whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice." The whole was a symbolical action, by which the Prophet intended to represent the victory which he had promised the king of Israel over the Syrians more clearly and fully to him. The shooting of the first arrow eastward, or to that part of the country which the Syrians had taken from his predecessors, was a declaration of war against them, and his striking the other arrows against the ground was an indication of the victories he would obtain, but the imperfection or limitation of his success was denoted by his stopping too soon. Joash conquered several cities, and gained three signal victories over the Syrians, as Elisha predicted. He was succeeded by his son, Jeroboam II.

JOB, a celebrated Patriarch of sacred antiquity whose patience has become proverbial, was contemporary with Eliphaz the Temanite, the third in descent from Esau, and with Amram the father of Moses, the third in descent from Jacob. The Land of Uz, in which he resided, is supposed to indicate a territory on the confines of Idumea, if not a part of that ancient inheritance of the Edomites, for we read that Aram, the son of Shem, had a son so named, Gen. x. 23: the same name was borne by a son of Nahor, Abraham's brother, Gen. xxii. 21, and by a grandson of Seir the Horite, who gave his name to that region afterwards occupied by the Edomites. Some have attempted to identify Job with the Jobab who reigned in the Land of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 33, but the names are different in the original, and there are other difficulties which oppose this notion. There is a tradition that Job's wife was Dinah, the daughter of Jacob and Leah—a mere Rabbinical fancy, unworthy of refutation. As the scene of his sufferings and his patience is laid in a country occupied by Abraham's descendants in various lines, and as we apparently find that Patri-

arch's descendant in one of Job's friends—Bildad the Shuhite (Shuah was a son of Abraham by Keturah), it seems not unlikely that Job himself was a descendant of Abraham, though it is impossible to determine the line of his descent.

There is no book in the inspired canon which has caused so much controversy as the Book of Job, regarding its authenticity and reality, the time in which Job lived, and the author of the sublime composition. The statement already given, making Job contemporary with that Eliphaz the Temanite, who was the third in descent from Esau, is given on the authority of Dr Kennicott, but there are various other and very different computations. While it is clear that whatever may be the era assigned in which Job flourished, it was undoubtedly before the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and in the Patriarchal period, he has been placed in almost every age from the birth of Abraham till *after the Babylonish Captivity*. The Bible chronology assigns the date of the transactions with which the Book opens at B.C. 1520, being twenty-nine years previous to the exodus of the Israelites, and this computation seems to be founded on the principle of putting the history as low as possible, consistently with the necessity of fixing it earlier than that great event in the history of Jacob's posterity. One remarkable circumstance connected with the history of Job is, that though the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, the destruction of the Egyptians, the manna in the Desert, and many other extraordinary occurrences, which could have been introduced with great propriety into a discussion on the ways and works of Providence, all occurred within the vicinity of Job's residence, a total silence is maintained respecting those mighty signs and wonders—a conclusive proof that the events recorded in the history of Job's life took place before those important transactions. There are certain intimations, moreover, which show that the time of Job could not be earlier than that of Jacob, although Dr Hales

fixes the period of the Patriarch's trials at *one hundred and eighty-four years before Abraham's birth*. Without seriously examining this apparently preposterous statement, it will be observed that Bildad the Shuhite already mentioned was probably a descendant of that Shuah who was a son of Abraham by Keturah; and Eliphaz the Temanite evidently took his denomination from Teman, the son of another Eliphaz, who was a son of Esau, and his name from that ancestral Eliphaz. Dr Hales thinks that the silence maintained respecting the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, which were near the Land of Uz, is a proof that the events recorded must have occurred before Abraham's migration to Canaan. This, however, is an argument which may be controverted by the fact, that though it is plainly revealed to us that the destruction of the Cities of the Plain was the direct and visible work of God for the abominable wickedness of the inhabitants, it might not have appeared so either to the guilty sufferers, or to the natives of the surrounding nations. It was made known to Abraham as a Divine judgment by an immediate communication from God, and if this had not been the case, it is probable that the dreadful calamity recorded in the Book of Genesis would have been omitted there also, and we would have been in total ignorance of the origin of those mysterious waters which compose the Dead Sea.

There are various facts in the Book of Job which plainly intimate that he must have flourished in the Patriarchal times. One is his longevity, for he survived his calamities one hundred and forty years, and was probably more than two hundred years old when he died—which induce us to place him not *sooner* at least than the time of Isaac, who lived one hundred and eighty years. A second is the species of idolatry alluded to in the Book, which prevailed anciently in Arabia Felix, namely Sabeanism, or the worship of the heavenly bodies, which is universally admitted to be the most ancient of all the systems of idolatry: and these

Sabeans are supposed to have derived their name and origin from Sheba, the son of Yoktan, or Joktan, a son of Abraham by Keturah, whom that Patriarch sent into the "east country," and whose descendants were always notorious plunderers, and accustomed to predatory incursions against their neighbours. Another most conclusive fact is one which is subsequently noticed, namely, that the manners and customs noticed in the Book of Job strictly correspond to those of the Patriarchal period. The Arabian Patriarch acted as priest in his own family, according to primitive usage—his riches are reckoned by his cattle, and yet there is no enumeration of horses and mules, and he mentions the most ancient mode of writing, which was by sculpture. There are other circumstances which might be noticed, but they will occur to any one who attentively peruses the Book of Job, which is the oldest in the canon of Scripture, and therefore the oldest in the world.

Several Jewish Rabbins contend that Job is a fictitious character, and that the whole narrative is merely intended to instruct through the medium of parable, after the manner of those of our Saviour, and designed to convey useful and important sentiments respecting the superintending providence of God, in a manner more forcible and impressive than in the form of abstract rules and precepts. This opinion has been advocated by some Christian interpreters, and it fortunately happens that the belief or disbelief in the personal existence of Job neither involves the canonical authority of the Book which bears his name, nor does it imply either orthodoxy or error of doctrine. But two things must be carefully noted—the one that the Scripture itself bears unequivocal testimony to the reality of the persons and the events recorded in the Book—and the other, that the Book itself affords internal evidence to the same effect. As to the former, the Prophet Ezekiel (xiv. 14) recognises the existence of Job in the most distinct manner, mentioning him with Noah and Daniel as no

less a real personage than those two distinguished characters of inspired history; and St James (v. 11) refers to his patience, and to the illustration which his story affords of God's pity and tender mercy. And as to the latter, we have those particulars which are generally omitted in fictitious narratives, such as Job's personal history and localities, his family, the number of his cattle, and the residences of his friends. In addition to these arguments, we are entitled to render the utmost deference to the general and standing belief of the Jewish and Christian Churches, and to the opinions of the great body of commentators in all countries, and of all religious denominations, who treat the Book of Job as a true narrative, and there is nothing in it to make us incline to the contrary.

One of the most extraordinary hypotheses connected with the illustration and explanation of the history of Job is that advanced by Bishop Warburton, in his illustrious work, the "Divine Legation of Moses," where he has an express dissertation on the subject. He contends that the Book is a dramatic poem, written by Ezra some time between the return of the Jews from the Babylonish Captivity and their complete settlement in their own country, and adapted to their peculiar circumstances by being made allegorical as well as dramatic. According to this view of the case, Job is designed to personate the Jewish people, and his three friends represent the three great enemies of the Jews, who upon their return from captivity vexed and obstructed them in rebuilding the city and Temple of Jerusalem, namely, Sennacherib, Tobiah, and Gesem. Job's wife was intended by the poet to represent the idolatrous wives whom many of the Jews had married contrary to the Law, and which is severely reproved by Nehemiah. It is unnecessary to follow Warburton throughout his proofs, that the composition of the Book is dramatic, or to state the reasons for his conclusion that the whole is a work of imagination, and allegorical. The learned prelate, whose

opinions, even when disputable, are entitled to respect, rests his proof that the **Book of Job** is not older than the time of **Ezra** on two points—the one just noticed, that it is altogether an allegorical dramatic poem, and the other his notion of an equal Providence under the Mosaic dispensation. This latter point, he contends, is the grand question discussed throughout the **Book**, and he argues that it could be no question, or not properly understood, out of the Land of Judea, and still less at any period of the history of the Jews either before or after the time of **Ezra**. The great subject of discussion he supposes to be—Whether God administers his government over men in this world with an equal providence, so that the good are always prosperous and the wicked unhappy—or whether, on the contrary, there be not such apparent inequalities as that prosperity and adversity often happen indifferently to the upright and the bad. The Bishop alleges that the supposed or allegorical **Job** maintains the latter proposition, and his three friends the former. “Could any thing,” he asks, “be conceived more reasonable and necessary at this time than such a work as the **Book of Job**, in which, on a traditional story of great fame and reputation all over the East, a good man was represented as afflicted for the trial of his virtues, and rewarded for his afflictions, and in which their doubts about God’s providence were piously resolved into his Almighty Power? For to quiet all their anxieties, and to comfort them under their present distresses, was, I suppose, the reason of one of their Prophets composing the **Book of Job** at this very period. If such was the end of writing this poetic story, we cannot but suppose that every thing in it would be fitted to the circumstances of the times; but this could not be done without making the poem allegorical as well as dramatic, that is, representing the real persons of that age under the persons of the drama.” One remarkable personage in this drama is **Satan**, the author and contriver of all the mischief. Bishop Warburton

contends that this assault of **Satan** upon **Job** was that which the Prophet **Zechariah** (ii. 13; iii. 1) made at this time on the Jewish people:—“The only difference is, that in the prophecy **Joshua** the high priest stands for the people, and in this poem **Job**; in all the rest the identity is so strongly supported, that this single circumstance is alone sufficient to confirm the truth of our whole representation.—The mention of **Satan** is a certain proof that the work was composed in the age we assign to it; this evil being was little known to the people till about this time.” The last person noticed in the drama is **Elihu**, and he, according to Bishop Warburton, was **Ezra**, or the sacred writer himself. Such is the substance of a theory which this great man discusses with his usual learning and ability, but certainly with no small degree of fancy. The hypothesis is examined by Peters, in his “Critical Dissertation on the **Book of Job**,” who contends in opposition that the **Book** is the oldest in the world—that it was written probably by **Job** himself—and that it contains in the main a true history. Others, again, admit the outlines of the story to be true, but that it is written in a poetical strain, and decorated with peculiar allusions to make the narrative profitable and interesting.

There is no doubt of the fact that the being rendered *Satan*, or the *adversary*, was little known to the Jews till after their return from the Captivity, and on this position Bishop Warburton is unsailable; but this strong circumstance might be obviated by supposing, what was in all likelihood the case, that the introductory part, in which **Satan** makes such a conspicuous figure, was revised and amended by **Ezra** or some other person after the Babylonish Captivity. We know that **Ezra** collected and arranged the Old Testament canon, and that he inserted in the Mosaic history the names of many towns which were not in existence till after the conquest of the Promised Land. Grotius accounts for the mention of **Job** by **Ezekiel**, by supposing

that the events recorded in the history occurred in Arabia while the Hebrews sojourned in the Desert—that the writer, who was a Hebrew, lived before the time of Ezekiel, but after David and Solomon, from whose compositions he thinks some sentences or forms of speech are transferred, and that it was written for the edification of the Edomites transported to Babylon, to encourage them to patience in adversity, and to confirm them in the worship of the true God. But this hypothesis is liable to many objections. Le Clerc supposes that the Book, which he views as a history treated in the form of a parable, or in a poetical manner, was written after the Jews were carried to Babylon, and urges in proof the frequent Chaldaisms which it contains; but this latter statement is denied by a learned Continental critic, who affirms that Le Clerc's Chaldaisms, such as the termination *in* for *im* in the plural, are true Hebrew and Arabic, and of the most ancient stamp. It is certain, whoever was the author of the Book, that the style of it has a mixture of the Arabic, and we accordingly find that those scholars who have offered the most ingenious solutions of difficulties, and the best explanations of particular passages, have been more indebted to their acquaintance with Arabic than with the Chaldee. Nor is this surprising, for Abraham's sons by Keturah, from one of whom Job is supposed to have descended, peopled the remarkable peninsula of Arabia to a considerable extent before their amalgamation with Ishmael's descendants, and they would certainly carry with them the language of their common ancestor.

The authorship of the Book of Job has been almost as much disputed as any other question connected with it. The claims of Job himself, Moses, Solomon, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Ezra, and others, have been severally maintained by different learned writers. There is every reason to conclude that whoever was the writer, it was composed in or about the time in which Job lived. Most of the Jewish Rabbins contend that Moses is the writer

—an opinion now popularly received, and Huet, with whom Michaelis concurs, supposes that it was written by Moses in the country of Midian, where he resided for forty years. Others argue that the Book was either written or translated from the original Arabic by Moses to prepare the Israelites for their departure from Egypt, and the hardships of their future peregrinations. Dr Lightfoot, on the other hand, inclines to the opinion that Elihu was the writer. This opinion is refuted by Bishop Lowth of Oxford, who examines the claims of Moses, to whom it is commonly ascribed. This hypothesis, according to him, is very futile, because it is impossible to trace throughout the Book the slightest allusion to the manners, customs, ceremonies, or history of the Israelites. But this opinion might be met by the argument, that if Moses wrote the Book of Job in the Land of Midian, he did so before he was called in the remarkable manner recorded to appear before Pharaoh, and to become the leader of the chosen people—the history, the manners, and the customs of the Israelites, then oppressed in Egypt, were of little importance to be introduced into such a performance, the scene of the transactions in which is Idumea—the history of an inhabitant of that country being the basis of the narrative—the characters who speak Idumeans, or at least Arabians of the adjacent country, and all originally of the race of Abraham. Bishop Lowth considers the style of Job to be materially different from the poetical style of Moses, and much more compact, concise, or condensed in the conformation of the sentences. This inclines him to the opinion that Job himself, or some contemporary, was the writer of the poem, which he thinks is proved from the subject, the language, the general character, and even the obscurity of the work.

Professor Lee of Cambridge has completely investigated the history of this ancient Patriarch, in a work published in 1837 entitled the "Book of the Patriarch Job, translated from the original Hebrew,

as nearly as possible in the Terms and Style of the Authorized Version." The learned Professor—one of the most distinguished Oriental scholars of his age—adds an "Introduction on the History, Times, Country, Friends, and Book of the Patriarch, with some strictures on the statements of Bishop Warburton, and of the Rationalists of Germany on the same subjects." Professor Lee maintains that the Book is neither parable nor allegory, but is in all probability real history. He is of opinion that the historical introduction to the Book and the concluding chapter were written by Moses after the times of Job:—"My reasons for this opinion are these—first, not only is the style at variance with that found in the rest of the Book, but the language itself is materially different. In these portions we have, as far as we can now judge, language of the purest Hebrew composition, while in the body of the work there is a very visible inclination to the forms and significations peculiar to the Chaldee." After producing a variety of examples, in which Professor Lee contends that Job himself was the author, and that Moses wrote the introductory and supplementary portions, our distinguished translator and critic thus animadvert on the objection urged against Moses being the writer of the historical part, because there are no allusions in the Book to the Jews, contending, at the same time, that Job himself was the author of the whole work with those exceptions.

"It will be found, I think, by all who take the trouble to inquire, that those writings which originated with Moses never proceed beyond the necessities, the circumstances, or, as far as prophecy is concerned, the fate of the Jews. The religion inculcated by Moses is that of the theocracy only; it never extends itself beyond the boundaries of Judea, and if it occasionally found its way to foreigners, this was under the character of proselytes. It provided, indeed, for the cessation of the theocracy, and foretold times in which the Gentiles would rejoice with God's people, as it also did for the

rejection of the unbelieving Jews—for predictions of this cast necessarily reached beyond the times of the theocracy. But as far as the legislation and religious observances peculiarly belonging to Moses were concerned, they were strictly exclusive and limited. *With Job, however, the case is totally different.* This Patriarch indeed retains the sacrificial rites of his predecessors, and as a Prophet conducts his readers to those times—the *latter day*—in which a Redeemer should appear upon the earth, and even to that period in which he himself should in his flesh see God. So far he may be said to have concurred with the great legislator of the Jews, but here the concurrence ends. Job, unfettered by the exclusive system of the theocracy, deals boldly and fully in doctrines which are universal in their scope, and eternal in their nature. He enters intrepidly into the most abstruse considerations respecting the Divine Mind; he descants on its moral attributes, its metaphysical existence, ubiquity, incomprehensibility, and eternity. He dwells on its justice, mercy, long-suffering, and goodness; and with a freedom and light worthy of Christian times, determines that it is its unalienable property to dispense at once both riches and poverty, good and evil; and, by the operations of a particular Providence, to follow with blessings or cursings respectively the good and the evil, whatever their stations in life might otherwise be."

"It may be suggested, perhaps, that, as Job must have led a pastoral life, and have resided in a desert far removed from political considerations, the haunts of philosophy, the elegancies of art, and the general profusion of wealth, necessary for the high philosophical flights noticed which it contains, it could hardly be expected that such a book could have come from him.—But it is evident from the Book itself that Job was a prince of great wealth and influence in his day. He resided in a country, moreover, remarkable for its merchandize and wealth. Its proximity to the Euphrates and Tigris procured it eminent advantages in this

respect.—The deserts of Arabia abound with animals, the largest, most various, and most formidable, and particularly with the ostrich, of which Job speaks at considerable length. Arabia, also, had its mines of gold; and by its merchandise had iron and brass in abundance. The philosophers, too, of Chaldea, in whose neighbourhood Job resided, could supply such a mind as our Patriarch manifestly possessed with information on natural history, astronomy, and the like: and it is sufficiently evident from Job himself that book-writing was no new thing in his day.”

Of the Book of Job, as it respects the subjects discussed, Professor Lee thus writes:—“Debate allows of an extensive range of inquiry, of illustration, of proof, and the like, into which mere dialogue or narrative can never enter. In this point of view the Book of Job is certainly one of the most interesting ever presented to the world. It is the most comprehensive as to its range of inquiry, illustration, and proof; and what is still of more importance here, it is the most full on the subjects of doctrine and experience ever yet known. It should seem almost incredible that, within the short space of thirty-nine not very long chapters, it should dwell with such minuteness and accuracy on the character of God, of angels, of man—on the creation, the fall, redemption, death, the resurrection of the body, the renewal or regeneration of man—on past history, and events to happen in futurity—on the mysteries of nature, and subjects of natural philosophy—the depths of the ocean, the heights of the heavens—the wealth and treasures of the bowels of the earth—the wonders of the starry firmament, the poisonings of the clouds, the stroke of the thunderbolt—the beauties of the feathered tribe, the courage of the war-horse, the horrors of the trumpet, of the day of battle, of starving poverty, and of wretchedness;—and, above all, the inscrutable glories—necessarily incommunicable to man, but shrouded in clouds and thick darkness—visible only in the immediate

presence of the Deity. And yet nothing seems crowded, unnaturally contracted, or short; every discussion grows naturally out of the preceding one; and, while the whole affects nothing, attempts neither to astonish nor confound, we are insensibly and delightfully conducted into matter the most profound, awful, and instructive. Heavenly wisdom and earthly knowledge are so intimately connected, united, and discussed, that the natural inlets to the one—sense, reason, and reflection—are, without any efforts on our part, made also the channels through which the mind is enlightened, refreshed, raised, refined, and delighted by the other.—I shall conclude, therefore, merely by remarking, that the most severe inquiry into its contents, the most careful comparison of it with the rest of Holy Scripture, the genuineness of its piety, the purity and beauty of its morality, the great extent of its range, the exquisite chasteness at once of its style and sentiments, and, above all, the solidity and depth of its devotion, cannot but conspire to recommend it as one of the most valuable productions of antiquity; and, at the same time, as a Book of undoubted inspiration, and of the most unquestionable canonical authority.”

JOEL, the second of the Twelve Minor Prophets, was the son of Pethuel, or Bethuel, and, according to some accounts, of the tribe of Reuben. He is said to have been a native of Bethhoron, probably the town of Lower Bethhoron in the territory of Benjamin, between Jerusalem and Casarea, but no particulars are preserved of his life. It is generally admitted that he lived in the reigns of Uzziah, king of Judah, and of Jeroboam II. king of Israel, and that he delivered his prophecies soon after Hosea commenced his prophetic ministry, though some writers, both Jewish and Christian, have assigned to him a later period. An ancient author relates that Joel died in peace at the place of his nativity.

The style of Joel is characterized as elegant, perspicuous, copious, and fluent, and

he is also sublime, energetic, and animated, but it is also acknowledged that there is great obscurity in his subject, and particularly in the latter part of his prophecy. He upbraids the Israelites for their idolatry, and announces the calamities they would suffer as the punishment of that sin; nevertheless he endeavours to support them with the comfort that their miseries would have an end upon their reformation and repentance. The Prophecy of Joel consists of three chapters, which may be appropriately divided into three discourses or parts. In the two first chapters the full force of prophetic poetry is displayed, and the descriptions of the plague of locusts, of the deep national repentance, and of the happy state of the Christian church in the last times of the Gospel, are wrought up with great force and beauty.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, the son of Zachariah and Elisabeth, and the forerunner of Christ. Both Zachariah and his wife Elisabeth were advanced to a great age, and seem to have long given up all hope of children. But the period prophesied by Daniel was now drawing to a close, and the return of miracles and the gift of prophecy were to announce that God was about "to visit and redeem his people." Zachariah was a priest, and while, according to his course, he was burning incense and offering up prayers for the deliverance and redemption of Israel within the first veil of the Temple, and the people were silently praying in the court, the angel Gabriel stood beside the altar, and announced to the pious old priest that "his prayer was heard," that his wife Elisabeth should bear a son, who, according to the last intimation of the revelation of heaven by Malachi, should prepare the way of the Lord and Redeemer of Israel. He gave the coming forerunner of the Saviour a name, indicating that God would have mercy and show favour to his people, and commanding that he should be brought up from his birth as a Nazarite like Samson, drinking neither wine nor strong drink. To the aged priest, who knew that the days of miracu-

lous interposition had long ceased, and could not at once believe that it was so to commence in him, he gave a sign of the certainty of the event which he had foretold—Zachariah should be dumb till the birth of his child. After the two Sabbaths of his service in the Temple were over, he returned to his own house, which seems to have been in the city of Hebron, in the mountainous region of Judea, one of those assigned to the priests.

In due time God fulfilled his promise, and on the eighth day after the birth of the child, when he had to undergo the initiatory rite of the Law and receive his name, the tongue of his father was loosed, and in the spirit of prophecy, which had been silent for 400 years, he declared that God, according to his promise in all the ancient prophets, had now at last come to visit and redeem Israel—that the day-spring of hope from on high had at last risen, to give the full light of salvation to those who had so long sat in darkness and the shadow of death. He addressed the child of his old age, and declared what was to be his character and high office as the Prophet of the Highest, and the preparer of his ways.

We know little of the early life of the Baptist. Luke informs us that "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel." It is supposed that he lost his aged parents while yet young, though it is doubted whether the Zachariah whom Christ accuses the Jews of having slain between the Temple and the altar be the father of John, or whether he and Elisabeth died in peace. Who afterwards attended to the supply of his few and simple wants is not told us, and we are left to conjecture whether any but the Spirit of all knowledge and truth superintended his education, and trained him up in the knowledge and fear of God. He lived far from the pomp and luxury of courts, and the noise and wickedness of cities. Along with every Jew he was bound to attend at the three solemn festivals of the Mosaic Law, but

from his stern and severe character, we may be assured that he performed that duty in the spirit of pure devotion. We are led to conclude that he lived as a hermit in the wilderness, holding little intercourse with men, and seeing little of their ways, except when he came from his solitary converse with God, and his own thoughts, to look in sorrow upon the empty parade of Pharisaic worship, and the gross corruption of his degenerated and benighted countrymen. Like Elijah the Tishbite, whose spirit and power dwelt within him, and whose character of a reprover of the sins of the people, and restorer of the strictness and purity of the law, he was to sustain, he was clothed in a garment of coarse camel's hair, with a leathern girdle about his loins—his food was such as the trackless and uninhabited deserts supplied—locusts and wild honey, and his only drink the water from the brook.

Thus lived John the son of Zachariah in the solitude of the deserts till he was about thirty years of age, at which time, according to the Law, he was fitted to take upon him his father's office of priest, and to serve in the Temple. But it does not appear that he ever claimed or took upon him this office. He was destined for a higher and more important duty than that of all the priests and prophets. "The word of God came to him in the wilderness," and like Elijah after his forty days solitary uning in the desolation of Horeb, and his interview with the Searcher of hearts, he came forth to the abodes of men to rebuke, exhort, and warn. Many of the Jews who were studying the prophecies, and observing the signs of the times, were now looking with hope to the promises given to their fathers of old, and were expecting consolation to afflicted Israel. We well know that the wisest and holiest of them had but very indistinct conceptions of what that consolation and deliverance was. We cannot suppose that even John, or any of the Prophets, understood exactly in what manner the predictions, which they were commissioned by the

Spirit of God to utter, were to be fulfilled. The Baptist indeed felt the "burden" of that high commission which he was to execute, and was urged by a strong necessity to call the people to repent and prepare for the coming of the reign of Messiah. But though by his mother he was the relation of Jesus according to the flesh, he had never yet seen that predicted King, whose harbinger he was, and whose way he now went forth to prepare. As a new star in heaven had announced to the benighted inhabitants of the earth the descent of Him who was King of kings, and Lord of lords, so now a human messenger with a commission from on high announced that the great Deliverer was about to enter upon his work of patient labour and humility, of rejection, and sorrow and suffering.

The self-denying and austere Nazarite was no prophet of soft words, no smooth-tongued flatterer of the follies and errors of his countrymen, with which and with whom he had no common sympathy. Before they could expect that deliverance, before they could enjoy that consolation, they must repent of their errors and reform their lives. The time was now come when the axe was to be laid to the root of the unfruitful tree, when the wheat was to be sifted from the chaff. Hitherto God had confined the manifestations of his will to the children of Abraham, but now this preacher of repentance and righteousness told them that this privilege would be of no avail, unless they showed themselves worthy of the favour which God had confined to them. The spiritual kingdom which was now to be erected was not one simply of rites and ceremonies. These material types of spiritual things were now to cease—the barriers which had inclosed them as a peculiar people separate from all the world were to be thrown down, and those alone were to be admitted into this kingdom who feared God in spirit and in truth, and wrought righteousness.

The expectations of the Jews were generally directed toward the appearance

of their promised Messiah, and the wonderful events which had occurred at the birth of the Baptist and of Jesus could not have been altogether forgot. The character and manner of their ancient prophets were not unknown, the appearance of so extraordinary a teacher, who assumed such a high style of authority, who spoke in the language of such stern rebuke and severe censure, could not fail to excite public attention. Multitudes of all ranks and sects and professions crowded to the preaching of John—Pharisees and Sadducees, publicans and soldiers. Many confessed their sins, and were baptized, professing their repentance and preparation for the coming of the kingdom of God. The Baptist, however, gave them no encouragement to suppose that the external rite or verbal profession would serve them, unless they showed by their future conduct that their repentance was sincere. Having good reason to doubt the sincerity of the self-righteous and proud Pharisees, as well as that of the licentious and infidel Sadducees, he warned them to flee from the wrath to come, calling them a generation of vipers, who, unless they repented and believed now, would be consigned over to judicial blindness, and the eternal vengeance of an offended God.

An opinion began to prevail among the people that this might indeed be their long expected Messiah, but John soon corrected the mistake, and declared that he was not worthy of the meanest office in the kingdom of him whose harbinger he was. The attention of the Pharisees was also called to the proceedings of one who, they thought, usurped an authority which they claimed to themselves—that of teaching the true meaning of the Law. They sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ascertain from himself who he was, and by what authority he baptized converts to a new profession of belief. He told them, as he had done the people, that he was not the Christ. They asked him whether he was Elias the prophet, whom, according to the prophecy of Malachi, they expected to announce the

coming of their great Deliverer, and to anoint him for his public office. John, either out of humility, as some think, or from not thoroughly comprehending the full nature of his own commission, or because he knew that the Pharisees entertained false notions in regard to the office of Elijah the Tishbite, answered in the negative. He declared that he was not any other prophet of the Old Testament whom they erroneously looked for, but though he was neither Elijah whom they expected, nor the prophet Jeremiah, yet he baptized them with water as the symbolic preparation for the Messiah, who was already among them.

It does not appear certain whether this message was before or after the baptism of Christ; but when the preaching of John had aroused the expectations of the Jews, Jesus also came to bear testimony to the commission and office of his forerunner. It was revealed to the Baptist by a sign from heaven that this was the Messiah, and under a humble sense of his inferiority, he would have rather received than administered the rite of baptism; but his objections were removed by Christ, who, though sinless himself, was the vicarious representative of sinners, and in their stead submitted to all the emblematic rites of the Law. The Spirit descended like a dove and rested upon Jesus, and the heavens opened, and the voice of God proclaimed that this was His beloved Son. After this John repeatedly pointed out Christ to his followers as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world! This turned the attention of his disciples to Jesus, and they followed and conversed with him.

The great Teacher of truth, the promised Deliverer and Messiah, whom John declared had now entered upon his public undertaking, and like the Baptist's, his first proclamation was "to repent, for the kingdom of heaven was at hand." It does not appear that Jesus and John were much or frequently in the company of each other. The Baptist had received his commission, and faithfully executed

it, without any ambition of higher honour than that of the warning "voice crying in the wilderness." And now that the Sun of righteousness was risen, he, as the harbinger star of the morning, was willing that his borrowed and feeble rays should be eclipsed and lost in the full effulgence of Him whose rise he ushered in. While he was in Ænon, pursuing his duty, he was told that Jesus also was baptizing, and that all men were resorting to him. Instead of expressing any jealousy, as perhaps those who informed him of this new preacher of righteousness assuming his office expected, he expressed his exultation that his own testimony had been verified, that Christ alone could declare the whole truth of God, having the Spirit without measure, that those who believed in him would have everlasting life, and that those who rejected him would expose themselves to the wrath of God.

We have not many farther particulars of the preaching and labours of John. We learn only from the Evangelists that he was held in high esteem by the common people, who believed him to be a prophet. Many of them, according to the prophecy, he turned unto righteousness. But the boldness of his denunciations, and the austere severity of his manner, exposed him to the jealousy and hatred, and pretended contempt of the priests and rulers; they said that he was a madman, a deceiver "who had a devil." It does not appear that they attempted to lay violent hands upon him; but his zeal in the cause of truth and holiness exposed him to the cruelty of a more powerful enemy. He had reproved Herod the tetrarch of Galilee for his incestuous marriage with Herodias, his brother's wife, and his own niece, urging him to repentance. Herod was offended with this fearless discharge of duty, and at the instigation of Herodias would have put John to death, but from fear of the people, who, he knew, held him in high veneration, only imprisoned him in the castle of Machærus, where he was residing. Herod, though believed to be a

Sadducee, seems to have had frequent interviews with the Baptist, and was struck with the forcible exposition of the truth which he faithfully brought before him. He heard him gladly, as we are told by Mark, and in many respects complied with his doctrines. As far as depended upon him, he would have set the Baptist at liberty, for he allowed his disciples free access to him. The ardent mind of the bold reformer pined in this close confinement, and he seems to have thought that Jesus should have interfered by miracle to effect his deliverance. He therefore sent a deputation of his disciples to him with the querulous question, "Art thou He that was to come, or are we to look for another?" He must have been perfectly assured that Jesus was indeed the promised Deliverer, but apparently thought that it was his duty to inform Christ of his own necessary seclusion from the discharge of duty, hoping, perhaps, that his restoration to liberty with the high hand of miraculous power would confirm the authority, and advance the cause which both maintained. The answer sent by the compassionate Saviour conveyed a gentle rebuke of the mis-giving confidence which the Baptist had exhibited—"Blessed is every one who shall not be offended in me." But in honour of his great forerunner, he described him as more than a prophet, more highly distinguished and honoured than all the saints and prophets of old; but yet though he prepared the way for the kingdom of God, he was less than the least who should enjoy its blessings.

But the relentless rage of the abandoned Herodias contrived the means of satiating her implacable vengeance. At a sumptuous banquet which Herod gave on his birthday to his lords and officers of state and captains, she degraded herself and her daughter so far, as to send the latter to exhibit as a common dancer before the king flushed with wine. We know it is the custom in Oriental countries occasionally to bestow valuable presents on such individuals. The weak

and profligate king, delighted beyond measure at this disgraceful exhibition, swore to Salome that he would give her whatever she should ask, even to the half of his kingdom. Urged by her licentious mother, she requested that the head of John should be *instantly* given her in a charger. Such a demand might well both have disgusted and alarmed the king; but he had rashly bound himself by an oath, and a false regard to that and to his company made him outrage the eternal laws of justice, which with a king should be paramount to all other. He ordered one of his guard immediately to go and behead John in prison, and to give the bloody present to his guilty paramour. Thus wickedness seemed to triumph, and the bold voice of truth was silenced by the hand of lawless violence, and courage in defence of purity was borne down by shameless licentiousness. "The burning and shining light" of the Baptist's zeal was extinguished on earth, but only to shine more brightly in heaven, as the stars in the firmament. In due time disgrace and vengeance overtook all the actors in this bloody scene, who died in exile, in misery, or by violence. The disciples of John paid the last tribute of affection to his lifeless remains by laying them in a tomb, and in all likelihood afterwards became the followers of Jesus. It is supposed that the Baptist was beheaded about the thirty-third year of his age, after he had preached the doctrine of repentance and preparation for the coming of Christ nearly three years.

JOHN THE EVANGELIST, called the **DIVINE**, was the son of Zebedee and Salome, and younger brother of James the Greater. He was a native of the town of Bethsaida, and, along with his father and brother, pursued the trade of fisherman in the lake of Galilee. He is believed to have been the youngest of all the Apostles, being about twenty-five or twenty-six years old when called by Jesus to be his follower and disciple. If, as is probable, he was that disciple of John the Baptist who accompanied An-

drew on his first visit to Christ, he was one of the earliest who welcomed and believed the Messiah. From a remark made by the Council on the appearance of Peter and John before them, that they were "unlearned and ignorant men," we may conclude that the son of Zebedee had not the benefit of the learned education of his country, and there is nothing stated in the writings of the New Testament to countenance the notion of Jerome that he "was remarkable on account of his nobility." Neither is there any proof of what is stated by Theophylact that the wife of Zebedee was daughter of Joseph, and her sons nephews of Jesus.

But though neither learned nor noble, he understood the Scriptures, which were weekly read in the synagogue, so well as to be enabled to conclude that Jesus was the Deliverer promised of old to their fathers, and when, at last, Christ called him to be a "fisher of men," he hesitated not to leave his nets and follow him through the whole of his journeys and labours. He was one of the three that enjoyed the most intimate share of his Divine Master's confidence, and among them all he is distinguished as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." This eminent distinction was no doubt conferred upon him on account of the amiable dispositions and ardent affection which dwelt in his own breast, which made him more than all the rest resemble him in whom dwelt such inextinguishable and unexampled love to men. On several occasions the ardour of this affection for his Master caused him to err in its expression, as when he rebuked and forbade one to cast out devils in the name of Jesus, because he went not in their company; and when with his brother he would have avenged the ingratitude and inhospitality of the Samaritans by utter destruction.

From the marriage in Cana, where he is supposed to have been, though there is not the slightest foundation for supposing that he was the bridegroom on that occasion, till the ascension into heaven from the Mount of Olives, he never seems to have left his Master. so

that he could well say in the commencement of his first Epistle, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have contemplated, and our hands have handled, declare we unto you." He witnessed the homage paid to Christ's divinity by Moses and Elias in the Mount of Transfiguration; he reclined in his Saviour's bosom at the Last Supper, and asked him the question in regard to the traitor when others were afraid to put it directly; he was with him in the garden, and witnessed part of the mysterious agony, though with the other two he slept, and though in compassion Christ hid the darkest struggle of that hour of woe from them all. He fled indeed when all forsook Jesus, now in the hands of his persecutors, but strong affection soon hastened his return, and with Peter, whom he introduced into the high priest's hall, witnessed the whole scene of the trial, accompanied the mournful procession to the cross, and seems to have been the only one of the twelve who stood by his Lord amid the violence of armed soldiers, and the exulting shouts of the infuriated crowds. Affection did more than courage, and the weeping females and the gentle and beloved disciple faced dangers which appalled the bravery of the resolute and warlike Peter. That deep love, stronger than the fear of death, was there rewarded by the dying bequest of Christ, who committed Mary to the affectionate care of John, requesting her to be a mother to him, and him to be a son to her. He took her to his own house, which is believed to have been in Jerusalem, and reported to have been bought of Annas the high priest, with the money which he is said to have raised by the sale of his paternal property in Bethsaida. He was the first to satisfy himself of the reality of our Lord's resurrection, and was present at all the interviews he had with the Apostles and disciples. When they retired to Galilee for a little, it was he who first recognized Christ on the shore of the lake while

they were fishing, and of whom Christ said, in reply to a question from Peter, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

In the division of the field of labour among the Apostles, Asia is said to have fallen to the lot of John, but it is certain that he remained for a considerable number of years in Jerusalem, probably till the death of the Virgin, which is said to have happened about fifteen years after that of Christ. After the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the Apostles boldly proclaimed the doctrines of the cross, and wrought miracles in confirmation of their divine authority. The healing of the lame beggar at Solomon's porch raised a commotion among the people, and the priests and rulers getting alarmed, still, with all the obstinate bigotry which they had already shown, apprehended, examined, imprisoned, threatened, and would have punished or cut off the Apostles. But they were miraculously delivered, and commanded boldly to teach the people the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth, as they had done. They were now inspired with a resolution which no threats and no danger could daunt, and they boldly put it to the priests to judge, "Whether it was right in the sight of God to hearken unto them, more than unto God."

John and Peter seem to have been frequent companions in their labour. They were sent by the rest of the Apostles to Samaria to confirm and perfect the work of conversion which had been commenced in that city by Philip the deacon, for it appears that none but the Apostles had the power of conferring the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the power of working miracles. This Apostle was present at the great council held at Jerusalem to decide what liberty should be allowed the Gentile converts, and what injunctions of the Mosaic Law should be laid upon them. He was also one of the pillars of the church in that city who gave Paul "the right-hand of fellowship." At what time he left that city to preach the Gospel in Asia is not very certain.

Jerome says he founded the churches in that country; but this statement must be taken with very considerable allowance, for it is certain that Paul had planted many a church in the Lesser Asia, had frequently visited and confirmed them, and written epistles to them without once mentioning the name of John, or sending salutations to him, which we can scarcely suppose he would have omitted, had the beloved disciple resided as bishop of Ephesus during that period. It is more consistent with the history to conclude that he resided chiefly in Jerusalem, or at least confined his labours to the country of the Jews, till near the time when the "abomination of desolation" was to descend upon that impenitent and guilty people. But then he left the doomed city, and established many churches in Asia, extending his labours to Parthia, and even to India. Paul and Peter, along with many others of the Apostles, had long before borne witness to the truth by death, and after the fierce storm of destruction which accompanied the final overthrow of the Jewish nation, there had been many years of peace and prosperity to the Christians. The brutal Nero had been compelled to inflict upon himself that death which he had savagely rioted in inflicting upon others; Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, had each held the mock sovereignty of the world for a few short months; Vespasian and Titus had swayed the sceptre of imperial power with more impartial or benignant policy. Domitian, pre-eminent among the cruel and the bad emperors of the declining days of Roman power, now ruled the world. John, who was residing in Ephesus, was accused as one of the "impious," an enemy of the gods, and subverter of the religion of the empire, and sent bound to Rome, where he was condemned, as we are informed by Tertullian, to be cast into a cauldron of boiling oil. If this was true, which, however, is not mentioned by any other ancient historian, he was miraculously delivered, but instead of the evident interference of a Divine Power persuading the barbarous prince

of his wickedness, he sentenced the Apostle to perpetual banishment in Patmos, a small desolate island in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, not far from Ephesus. Here, though he was precluded from that labour of more active love in which he delighted, his solitude was cheered by angelic visits, and the panoramic view of the history of the church and of the world till the end of time was revealed to him. This was in the year ninety-five or ninety-six, and the bloody emperor having been cut off by a bloody death, his successor, Nerva, next year recalled all the sentences of prescription, and St John returned to Ephesus.

We learn from his own writings with what anxious care he superintended the affairs of the church, and resisted the progress of error, which had already begun to show itself in many forms. At the request of the Asiatic bishops he agreed to write an account of what he had heard from the lips of his Divine Master, and plainly and fully to exhibit the truth, in opposition to the various heresies which Cerinthus and the Gnostics were zealously disseminating. Before entering upon so great and important a work, he requested a general fast of all the churches of Asia to implore the Divine blessing upon the undertaking. Thus God, who brings good out of evil, made use of the false doctrines which were spreading like a leprosy over the fairest portions of his church, to give to all future believers the fullest and clearest proof of the divinity of Christ, and the amplest detail of the discourses which he delivered, which was yet possessed by Christians. Though the language which he uses, and the style in which his doctrines are delivered, are not the purest and most classical, yet the ideas themselves are so sublime, and the mysteries of Divine revelation so awful and heavenly, that he is generally compared to an eagle soaring to heaven gazing with rapture on its unborrowed and quenchless light.

We have no particular authentic account of his labours and travels among the Asiatic churches during the remain-

der of his life. He resided principally at Ephesus, but was indefatigable in visiting and exhorting and setting in order the churches all round. It is told that on one of these journeys he was much pleased with the countenance of a young man, whom he recommended to the attention of one of the pastors, who, after instructing him in the truths of Christianity, baptized him. Some time after the Apostle passing that way inquired about the youth, and found that he had fallen from his profession, and become captain of a band of robbers in the neighbourhood. The aged saint is said to have gone to their haunts, been seized, and at his own request led into the presence of their captain, who was so much affected with shame, that he attempted to flee. John affectionately remonstrated with him, till the tears of contrition showed that the erring young man was deeply sensible of the interest taken in him by the venerable father. He accompanied the Apostle back to the society of Christians, and was restored to their communion.

Though the church at Ephesus had received from its spiritual Head the character of being zealous for an orthodox purity of faith, "trying those who called themselves Apostles and were not, and had found them liars," yet the heretic Cerinthus or Ebion, or both, grieved the latter days of the Apostle by eagerly disseminating their false doctrines in that city. With such individuals, confirmed and obstinate in their error, the Apostles were to have no intercourse—were neither "to receive them nor bid them God speed." It is reported by Irenæus that John on one occasion entering a public bath found Cerinthus there, and hastily retreated, saying, "Let us flee, lest the bath fall, while such an enemy of the truth is within." It is usual with the modest scepticism of the day, which designates itself by the name of philosophic candour, to reject these apocryphal anecdotes. Had they been related of any heathen philosopher, they would have been received upon much less his-

toric evidence. The only other anecdote we shall quote from ecclesiastical history is related by Jerome, and the philosophic doubters have not thought it worth while to question it. Being now disabled from great age for the active duties of addressing the large public assemblies at any length, he yet requested to be carried thither, and day after day repeated his characteristic and favourite precept, "My little children, love one another." When asked why he told them nothing but this, he replied, that "it was the great command of Christ, and nothing else was necessary."

The time of John's death is not exactly known. It is supposed to have happened about the end of the first century. Epiphanius says he was ninety-four years old, but when we mention that other writers say he lived till the age of one hundred and twenty, it will give modern readers no very high idea of the accuracy of the chronology of those times. From Christ's answer to Peter, and from the other declaration that some were standing before him "who should not taste of death till they saw the Son of man coming in his kingdom," a belief was entertained that John should not die. Even after his death Augustine reports that he was told the Apostle only slumbered in his grave, while Nicephonis reports at large a story of the Saint's descending into his grave alive, and being translated to heaven during the night, nothing being found in the tomb next morning but his grave-clothes. This, with many other stories of the kind, is evidently fabulous, the production of an age when superstition and idolatry were engrafted upon the truth of the Gospel. Though not a martyr to the truth, in the usual modern sense of the word, we have seen, that along with the rest of the Apostles and disciples, he suffered imprisonment and persecution for its sake. He spent the latter years of his life in peace and quietness indeed, but never shunned danger or death when it lay in the path of his duty, and though, for the benefit of the church in that and all

succeeding ages, he was preserved for the field of Christian warfare long after all the other Apostles had fought the good fight, rested from their labours, and received the crown of victory, yet he drank largely of that cup of sorrow of which, along with his brother James, he professed his readiness to partake.

We cannot here enter into an analysis of his writings. If the third Epistle, which is addressed to Gaius, be the same person who hospitably entertained St Paul at Corinth, as seems probable, it was likely first written of all the rest. There is no allusion to any heretical teachers or errors prevailing, as there is in the second to the "Elect lady," or the "lady Electa," who is very expressly cautioned against receiving such into her house. These two being addressed to private individuals, were probably not known to the church till many years after their death, and for a time there were scruples in regard to their genuineness. There is, however, sufficient internal evidence that they were written by John. Of the first Epistle, which is a general inculcating of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel, and contains a strong caution and warning against the prevailing errors, there never was any doubt. The time and occasion of writing the Apocalypse and the Gospel we have already mentioned. Gibbon, along with some ancient teachers of Platonism, pretend that John borrowed the peculiar doctrines in regard to the Trinity, or at least the language in which he expresses these, from the philosophy of the eloquent Athenian. Any one who will trace to their origin the various opinions of the Grecian schools, or who will read the profound treatise of Cudworth, will be able to judge whence they derived the borrowed light of their philosophy. By the ancient fathers his Gospel and other writings are looked upon with the highest reverence and admiration, as a "theology which human understandings can never fully penetrate and comprehend," as "books more valuable than all treasure." "None is like the son of thunder for the

majesty of his speech, and the sublime dignity of his discourses."

Several apocryphal writings have been attributed to him, as "a book concerning the death and assumption of the virgin," one of his travels, and another of his acts; but, with the exception of those in the sacred canon, none have ever been received by any but some early heretics.

JOHN, surnamed MARK, the son of Mary, and a near relation of St Barnabas, is casually mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. He accompanied St Paul and Barnabas from Jerusalem to Antioch, and he assisted the Apostle and his coadjutor at Salamis, in the island of Cyprus, where "they preached the word of God in the synagogue of the Jews." John left them at Perga in Pamphylia when on their mission to the Gentiles, and his conduct seems to have offended St Paul, which subsequently caused a separation between him and Barnabas, who returned with John to Cyprus.

JONAH, or JONAS, was the son of Amittai, and a native of Gath-hepher, a town of Zebulun in the kingdom of Israel, and in after times in Galilee. Though he is placed the fifth in order of the Minor Prophets, he is generally considered the most ancient of all the Prophets, not even excepting Hosea. We are told that certain things were done by Jeroboam II., king of Israel, "according to the word of the Lord God of Israel, which he spake by the hand of his servant Jonah." If this means that the Divine command was delivered personally to Jeroboam by Jonah, it is plain that he lived in the reign of that monarch, and was contemporary with the earliest of the Prophets, Amos and Hosea; but if, which is more likely, it is to be understood that this "word of the Lord" by Jonah was a prediction delivered by him in a preceding reign, and fulfilled in that of Jeroboam, he was more ancient than the earliest of the other Prophets whose times can be ascertained. Both explanations have their respective advocates.

With the exception of his sublime ode in the second chapter, the Book of Jonah

is simply a narrative. It is related that the Prophet was ordered to proceed to Nineveh, the capital of the Assyrian empire, to denounce the impending judgments against its licentious inhabitants. He rashly resolved to decline the commission, and retired to Joppa, where he found a ship ready to sail to Tarshish, supposed in this case to indicate Spain, "so he paid the fare thereof, and went down into it, to go with them unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord," namely, from the place where God had usually manifested himself by revealing his will and word to his prophets. He might have concluded, though we are nowhere informed as to the cause of this mission to Nineveh being obnoxious to him, that Jehovah would not insist upon the execution of it when he was in a strange country, where there were neither prophets nor prophetic impulses, and if Jonah really thought he could thus secure himself by distance from the presence of the Lord, he could not have selected a place apparently better adapted for his purpose than the Spanish Tartessus, which was then one of the most remote in the known world. His disobedience, however, was not to be allowed to go unpunished. A dreadful storm arose while traversing the Mediterranean during the voyage, before the vessel was any distance from the shore; the angry billows threatened to engulf the ship and its devoted crew; the mariners betook themselves to their devotions, and "cried every man to his god, and cast forth the wares that were in the ship into the sea, to lighten it of them." During this time of danger Jonah was fast asleep in the interior of the vessel called the "sides of the ship," which seems to denote a roofed or ceiled room or cabin, to the sides of which conveniences were fixed where the sailors reposed. He was roused from his slumbers by the master of the vessel, who roughly addressed him—"What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us that we perish not." They proceeded, in accordance

with the practice of the times, and to which they were stimulated by their superstitious fears, to cast lots, that they might ascertain who was the supposed cause of this tempest, and by the special appointment of Divine Providence the lot fell upon Jonah.

The mariners at once concluded that the stranger was the cause of the angry tempest which threatened to overwhelm their frail bark, and to consign them to a watery grave. They addressed him, and requested that he would inform them who he was and what he had done. Jonah replied—"I am an Hebrew, and I fear the Lord, the God of heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land." Jonah not only informed them of his nation and his religion, but of his profession, and his disobedience of the command of God, at which they were "exceedingly afraid," and they asked him, "What shall we do unto thee, that the sea may be calm to us?" Jonah answered them, conscious that he was the cause of the tempest, "Take me up, and cast me forth into the sea, so shall the sea be calm unto you; for I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you." The Phœnician sailors, however, evinced great reluctance to do as Jonah advised them, and attempted to make towards the shore, but every effort was fruitless, and the tempest rather increased in violence. Convinced by Jonah's account of himself that the God whom he worshipped had brought this danger upon them, they made their petitions to Him, and entreated that they might not be punished as the murderers of an innocent man; and perceiving that the only chance of saving themselves was to act as the Prophet directed, they accordingly cast Jonah into the sea, and the tempest immediately ceased. This convinced them of the power and greatness of that God whom Jonah worshipped, which appeared both in raising the storm and in suddenly assuaging it, and they "offered a sacrifice unto the Lord, and made vows," or rather, they made vows to do so at the first opportunity.

We are told that "the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah ; and Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights." While in this situation he addressed the beautiful prayer to Jehovah contained in the second chapter, but as it has more the appearance of a thanksgiving after a deliverance than of a petition during trouble, it was rather the Prophet's ode of gratitude for escape from the dangers to which his conduct had exposed him. At the all-powerful command of Him who rules supreme throughout the whole animated creation, who made the sea and all that is therein, the extraordinary fish prepared to swallow the Prophet disgorged him alive upon the shores of the Mediterranean, at a spot which credulous tradition still points out. Jonah readily obeyed the second command of Jehovah, and proceeded to Nineveh to denounce the judgments of Heaven against its abandoned citizens. We are told that "Nineveh was an exceeding great city, of three days' journey." Opinions are divided respecting this statement, whether it was three days' journey in length or in circuit, but the latter is the more probable conclusion. It is indeed said that when Jonah arrived in the city he went into it a day's journey proclaiming its destruction, and this has been commonly understood to mean that he only went a day's journey into it, which is about twenty miles for a foot traveller, and stopped at a particular place where he delivered his message ; but this place may have been the extremity of the city nearly opposite to that at which the Prophet entered, and it may also intimate that the city was only a day's journey in length—the Prophet proceeding *through* it discharging the Divine command. All the ancient writers describe Nineveh as a great city, and in this respect they corroborate the statements of Jonah, but we are not to suppose that its site or all within its enclosure was literally covered with buildings. Its edifices would be much apart, and it would contain extensive parks, gardens,

fields, and open grounds, like Babylon and other ancient Oriental cities, and like the large cities of the East at the present time.

When Jonah arrived at Nineveh he began his intimations of its destruction—"Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown;" but this doom was conditional, and it would be averted by the repentance of the inhabitants. Throughout the whole Scriptures the promises and threatenings of God invariably have conditions annexed to them, which when not expressed are to be understood—his promises are made on the condition of obedience, and his threatenings on that of impenitence. The fame of the wonderful works of God, moreover, connected with the Jews, was spread over those Eastern regions, and made the Ninevites more disposed to listen to a man of that nation who came to them as sent by the great Jehovah, yet a consciousness of their own guilt was doubtless a principal reason of their attention to the Prophet. They understood the denunciation as altogether conditional, and they accordingly exhibited all the signs of repentance. A general fast was proclaimed, the king—whom Usher supposes to have been Pul, king of Assyria—"Arose from his throne, and laid his robe from him, and covered himself with sackcloth," and issued an order which showed the alarm which the preaching of Jonah had occasioned. "Let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God ; yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands. Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not?" This sincere and timely repentance was effectual. Nineveh fasted, and prayed, and repented, and Nineveh retained its splendour more than twice forty years afterwards :—"God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way ; and God repented him of the evil that he had said he would do unto them, and he did it not."

Jonah, instead of admiring the Divine

clemency, was disappointed at the result, and was alarmed lest his veracity would be suspected. He retired from the city, and prepared for himself a booth, over which a plant called a *gourd* sprang up miraculously in one night, and which by its spreading foliage sheltered him from the scorching heat of the sun. The Vulgate renders this gourd (*kikay.n*) as a species of ivy, but it is supposed that the castor-oil tree is indicated, which with its broad palmate leaves extends a grateful shade over the parched traveller. This conclusion is corroborated by local traditions, and by the fact that it abounds near the Tigris, where it often attains a considerable height. Jonah was "exceedingly glad of the gourd; but God prepared a worm when the morning rose the next day, and it smote the gourd that it withered. And it came to pass when the sun did arise, that God prepared a vehement (or *silent*) east wind; and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah, that he fainted, and wished in himself to die, and said, It is better for me to die than to live." He was here reproved for his impatient and querulous temper, and for repining at the clemency of Divine Providence in sparing the Ninevites, which was justified to his full conviction, and his complaints were silenced. "Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured, neither madest it grow, which came up in a night, and perished in a night. And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle?"

We have no authentic information respecting the farther history of Jonah. It is conjectured that he returned to his own country, where he died, and a tomb was shown as his in the time of Jerome at a place within the tribe of Zebulun, at a short distance from Sepphoris, on the road to Tiberias. Benjamin of Tudela notices it as on a hill near the same place, and Thevenot informs us that the Turks had built a mosque over the

sepulchral cave, which they held in such veneration that no Christian was allowed to go near it. On the other hand, a tomb of Jonah is shown at Mousul, the representative of the ancient Nineveh. The Mahometans, who have a garbled version in the Koran of the story of Jonah, hold him in high consideration. Among other testimonies to Jonah as a prophet of eminence may be noticed that of Tobit (xiv. 4-31), and of Esdras (2 Esd. i. 39). Jonah is also referred to by our Saviour in a very prominent manner, Matt. xii. 40, 41; xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29.

It is only necessary to observe briefly the remarkable event in Jonah's life which is casually noticed in the preceding narrative, his living entombment, if we may so speak, in the "belly" of the fish. Against this statement much profane witticism has been directed, and ridicule will doubtless still be employed by those who choose to deny that the Almighty has at "sundry times and in divers manners" exercised powers beyond the ordinary course of the laws He has appointed to govern nature. But those who believe that nothing is "too hard for the Lord"—who acknowledge His sovereign and controlling power—who humbly look from "nature up to nature's God," and admit that the Almighty Governor of the universe can exert, and occasionally has exerted, influences beyond the *ordinary* course of, but not always or perhaps at any time *against*, nature, to ensure the accomplishment of His purposes—such persons will find no difficulty in the narrative, or in the miracle recorded, which, *taken as a whole*, is not so extraordinary as some others recorded in Scripture.

It ought to be recollected that idle raillery and profane witticism against any of the statements of Scripture, at all times indicate a mind either unwilling to investigate the records of sacred antiquity, or a disposition to judge of them according to our imperfect notions and conceits. It is, moreover, a dangerous principle to attempt to account for the

miracles recorded in the inspired writings on common causes, as if they were studiously mystified by the sacred writers. The hand of God is distinctly recognized throughout the whole canon of inspiration—to Him alone is to be ascribed the mighty actions therein recorded, and every attempt to depreciate what is expressly said to be of God and not of man, must be viewed with indignation. It is, however, of some consequence to show that the circumstance before us is not physically impossible, although difficulties must remain under any explanation, which are more than sufficiently met by the miraculous character of the whole transaction. We must, indeed, bear in mind that “the Lord *prepared* a great fish to swallow up Jonah,” and this is an explicit acknowledgment of the special power of Jehovah exercised on this occasion. Nevertheless two objections have been commonly urged against the statement. As the whale is generally understood to be the “great fish” mentioned, it has been alleged that the circumstance was impossible, as whales are never found in the Mediterranean, and as the whale, if it were found in that Sea, has not swallow large enough for a man to pass. But the text does not say that the great fish was a whale—which is a name applied in the Scriptures to all the large inhabitants of the ocean, and not of any one of the Mammalia class so called. Yet if even the whale was intended, supposing it to be known in the Mediterranean, which it certainly is not, there is no necessity to suppose that Jonah was actually swallowed, but merely detained in its mouth; and Scoresby informs us that the mouth of a common whale, when open, presents a cavity as large as a room, being six or eight feet wide, ten or twelve feet high in front, and fifteen or sixteen feet long—thus capable of containing a merchant-ship’s jolly-boat full of men. This fact induced Bishop Jebb to urge several considerations showing that the “great fish,” into whose cavity Jonah was taken, probably was a whale—and the only objection which can be offered against it is

the fact already mentioned—that there is no authentic instance on record of whales having been ever found in the Mediterranean. This, however, does not render the circumstance impossible in the present case, for we are told that the Lord *prepared* the fish, which intimates that it was one specially provided for the occasion—one which was never seen in the Mediterranean before, and which may have disappeared to its native regions as soon as it had vomited the repenting Prophet. Until, therefore, it can be proved that there is no “great fish” capable of swallowing a man, every objection to the inspired statement is gratuitous, puerile, and presumptuous.

But there is another view of the case, which perhaps tends to elucidate the matter in a still clearer light. Bochart has proved very satisfactorily that a great fish of the *shark* kind is here intended—an opinion adopted by Parkhurst, and now generally received. “It is a well attested fact,” says Mr Hartwell Horne, “that many of the shark species are not only of a size so large as to be able without any miracle to swallow a man entire, but also that men have been found entire in their stomachs; and, since it is a fact well known to physiologists that the stomach has no power over substances endued with vitality, this circumstance will account for the miraculous preservation of the Prophet Jonah in the belly or stomach of the great fish, in which he was for three days and three nights. Bochart is farther of opinion, that the particular species of shark which swallowed the Prophet Jonah was the *squalus carcharius*, or *white shark*, for its voracity termed *lamia* by some naturalists, and which is a native of the seas in hot climates, where it is the terror of navigators.”

The reader who feels curious in this investigation will find it discussed at length in Bishop Jebb’s “Sacred Rature,” and in Bishop Gleig’s elaborate edition of Stackhouse’s History of the Bible. It may be observed on the whole subject, with Mr Jones of Nayland, that

"Jonah was not preserved by a miracle for his own sake, but for a sign, to instruct the people of God in the truth of their salvation, and in the peculiar means or mode of it. Our Saviour himself hath instructed us to make this use of Jonah's history." And by the repentance of the men of Nineveh "at the preaching of Jonas," God designed to upbraid the stubbornness of the Jews, and to shame them, as it were, into a similar course of duty, because the "men of Nineveh would rise in judgment against them," as our Saviour speaks of the Jews in his time.

JONATHAN, the eldest son of Saul, is one of the most amiable characters of whom we read in the Old Testament history. His many noble and generous virtues—his friendship and affection for David, whom he knew had been appointed to supplant him on the throne—his magnanimity and devotedness in incurring his father's resentment, and in hazarding his own life, to ensure the safety of his friend—have few parallels, and are certainly not surpassed in any history. It was after the remarkable encounter with the Philistine giant Goliath that he first saw David, and the conduct of the youthful hero on that occasion excited his admiration to such a degree, that he "loved him as his own soul." He honoured David with a present of his own robes, and made a covenant with him which was subsequently renewed. He disclosed to his friend the intention of Saul to kill him, and by his mild remonstrances with his father he effected a reconciliation between him and David, which, though it lasted a very short time, showed the generosity and kindness of Jonathan's disposition. He shared the misfortunes of his father, and was slain at Gilboa in a war with the Philistines, B.C. 1056. The beautiful ode which David composed when he was informed of the fate of his friend will be always admired for its tenderness and deeply-expressed affection. See DAVID.

JOSEPH, the most distinguished of the twelve sons of Jacob, and one of the

most celebrated personages of sacred antiquity, was born about B.C. 1745. He was the elder son of Jacob's beloved wife Rachel, and early became the favourite of his father, not only on account of his attachment to his mother, but for the personal and mental endowments which soon began to be developed in such a promising son. Joseph consequently incurred the hatred and jealousy of his brothers, who determined to rid themselves of this obnoxious rival. Jacob gave him, as a mark of his peculiar regard, a "coat of many colours," or *pieces*, as it is in the margin, which is generally thought to signify a garment wrought with threads of divers colours, or made up of variegated pieces of silk or stuff. This present seems to have excited the special resentment of Jacob's other sons, who saw an invidious distinction openly made by their father. Mr Roberts, in his work on India, gives us a remarkable illustration of this text. He tells us that in India it is at the present day customary to invest a favourite or beautiful child with a "coat of many colours," which are often tastefully sewed together. Mr Roberts adds, "A child being clothed in a garment of many colours, it is believed that neither tongues nor evil spirits will injure him, because the attention is taken from the beauty of the person to that of the garment."

With the beautiful and affecting history of Joseph, as recorded by the inspired writer, every one is familiar. It is a narrative perhaps unsurpassed in any language; it certainly is not excelled in any history; and abounding as it does with practical lessons of wisdom, it reaches the heart in a peculiarly affecting manner. Joseph, the unsuspecting object of fraternal envy, was a mere youth when he received from his doting father the "coat of many colours;" and, when by this "his brethren saw that their father loved him more than all his brethren, they hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him." He related two dreams to his brothers, which increased their hatred. "Behold," said Joseph in

his simple manner, "we were binding sheaves in the field, and, lo, my sheaf arose, and also stood upright; and, behold, your sheaves stood round about, and made obeisance to my sheaf." And again, "Behold, the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me"—namely, the constellations of the Zodiac, to him "the twelfth." He told the latter dream, and probably the former also, to Jacob, who "rebuked him," or checked him, that he might not become proud, and that he might not irritate his brothers; but "his father observed the saying." Jacob did not look upon the dream as a mere fancy; he carefully noted it, and laid it up in his heart.

Joseph was sent by his father to his brothers, who were feeding their flocks in Shechem, to inquire after the welfare of the flocks, and to bring immediate notice to Jacob. When he reached Shechem he found no appearance of them, and he was directed by a stranger to proceed to Dothan, where he would certainly find them. This place was a considerable distance from Shechem, but not too far for a solitary youth like Joseph to be sent after them. They descried his approach while yet at a distance, and resolved to embrace that opportunity of putting him to death. "Behold," they said, "this dreamer cometh. Come now, therefore, and let us slay him, and cast him into some pit, and we will say, Some evil beast hath devoured him; and we shall see what will become of his dreams." It was only on such an occasion as this that they could have any opportunity of gratifying their resentment. Alone, in the open field, and at a distance from their father's residence, they thought they could with impunity revenge themselves on one who was their father's avowed favourite, and invent any plausible story to account for his loss. The proposition, however, was opposed by Reuben, who said to them, "Shed no blood, but cast him into this pit that is in the wilderness; and lay no hand upon him." Several reasons may be assigned for this interference of Reuben, such as

the common feeling of humanity, fraternal affection, or the sense of responsibility to God for the murder of an unoffending brother, who had done them no injury. Josephus suggests that he may have either thought himself most concerned to save his brother, being the first-born, and therefore likely to be more severely blamed than the others, or he may have hoped, by compassionately preserving the favourite son, to recover that place in his father's affection which he had lately lost by committing a most revolting crime, Gen. xxv. 22. Whatever were Reuben's motives, we are expressly told that the proposition to cast Joseph into the pit was made by him "that he might rid him out of their hands to deliver him to his father again." As soon as Joseph approached they seized him in the most relentless manner, divested him of his "coat of many colours," and threw him into the pit, which was dry, and left him there to perish. What is meant by the *pit*, into which Joseph was cast, is an exhausted cistern or reservoir. Of these there are many in that country, in which rain water is collected, and which are soon dried in summer. After this transaction they sat down to refresh themselves, and it appears that Reuben had left them to devise some means of rescuing Joseph from the exhausted well—at least he knew nothing of their selling him to a caravan of Ishmaelitic or Midianitish merchants, who happened then to appear on their way to Egypt with their camels, "bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh." This was done by the advice of Judah, who relented, and reminded his brothers that it would serve their purpose equally well to sell Joseph to those merchants, and they would not be guilty of his blood. The advice was adopted, and Joseph was drawn up out of the well, and sold to the Arab merchants for twenty pieces of silver. The scene of this transaction is still pointed out to travellers in the vicinity of Shechem, now called Nablous. "Having cleared the intricate defiles of this part of the country," says Dr Rich-

ardson, "we got upon an extensive open field, which bore an abundant crop of thistles, and in which several herds of black cattle were feeding. This by some is supposed to be the scene of the infamous conspiracy of which the liberty of Joseph was the temporary victim. A little farther on we arrived at *Gib Yousouff*, or the pit into which Joseph was cast by his brethren, being a ride of three hours and forty minutes from Mensura. Here there is a large khan, and a well of very excellent water, and a very comfortable oratory for a Mussulman to pray in." Speaking of the same neighbourhood, Dr Clarke says—"Along the valley we observed a company of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, as in the days of Reuben and Judah, with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh, who would gladly have purchased another Joseph from his brethren, and conveyed him as a slave to some Potiphar in Egypt. Upon the hills around flocks and herds were feeding as of old; nor in the simple garb of the shepherds of Samaria was there any thing to contradict the notions we may entertain of the appearance formerly exhibited by the sons of Jacob."

When Reuben returned to the pit, or well, into which Joseph had been thrust, and found it empty, he rent his clothes, and joined his brothers in great distress. It is probable that they would soon tell him what they had done, for we find that they all leagued together in the story they told to Jacob about a wild beast having devoured Joseph, producing the well-known coat all besmeared with blood as a proof, and that they afterwards kept their secret, never attempting to assuage the grief of Jacob by assuring him of the probability that Joseph was still alive. Meanwhile Joseph was carried by his Arab masters to Egypt, and there sold to an officer of Pharaoh's household named Potiphar, who is described as "captain of the guard," or, as it is rendered in the marginal reading, *chief marshal*, or *chief of the slaughter men*, or *executioners*. It has been doubted whether slavery existed in Egypt previous to the period

when the ancient institutions of that country were in a great degree changed, and this instance of Joseph has been met by alleging that the tyranny of the Shepherd Kings must have had some operation in modifying the peculiar usages of the Egyptians. But such suppositions are at variance with well authenticated historical facts. The very first notice of that country in the Scriptures is connected with slavery. It was a king of Egypt who gave to Abraham, the great-grandfather of Joseph, male and female slaves, and we know that the condition to which the descendants of Jacob were ultimately reduced in Egypt was that of slavery. It is probable, however, that in a nation so civilized and so enlightened as the Egyptians, whose institutions were greatly influenced by their peculiar theocracy, the just law which protected the life of the slave from the anger of his master was of very remote antiquity among them. This inference is clear from the manner in which Moses narrates the story of Joseph's first adventures in Egypt.

Leaving Jacob in Canaan, in the utmost distress for the loss of his favourite son, and refusing any consolation for this grievous deprivation, it is our duty to follow Joseph in the new scene to which he was introduced. Although young in years he displayed the utmost prudence and integrity—"the Lord was with Joseph, and he was a prosperous man." His conduct secured for him the respect and confidence of Potiphar, who entrusted him with the charge of all his property. Here was Joseph's first transition from a state of degradation to a situation of trust and honour, and he who a little before was delivered to Potiphar as a slave, was now made steward to an influential nobleman, and the director of his fortunes. The handsome person and honourable bearing of the young Hebrew attracted the notice of the wife of Potiphar, who endeavoured to seduce him into a criminal intercourse, which Joseph resisted with a noble and generous indignation. Outstepping the modesty of

her sex, which none but the most abandoned and dissolute forget, she would have compelled him to yield to her guilty overtures, but he hastily and resolutely withdrew from her snares. Her former love was now turned into hate, and in revenge she preferred an accusation against Joseph, throwing all the infamy upon him, and arrogating all the virtue of resistance to herself. Potiphar, deceived by the false tale of his wife, and by the proof she produced, committed no personal violence upon his slave, though he believed that Joseph had acted most perfidiously and ungratefully towards him, and in a way which of all others was most calculated to provoke indignation and summary punishment. In this and in the case of the chief butler and chief baker which follows, we have another instance of the justice of the laws of the ancient Egyptians, which precluded even the king from inflicting an unjust punishment. Potiphar sent Joseph to the royal prison, apparently with the intention that, after trial and conviction, he should receive the chastisement which the law awarded to the offence of which he was accused.

We now follow Joseph to prison as a criminal, or at least as one charged with attempting to commit a heinous crime; yet even in this reverse of fortune, caused by female hatred and disappointed licentiousness, the virtuous conduct of the young Hebrew was duly appreciated and rewarded, if rewards can be conferred in such a place and under such circumstances. The God of his fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who had an extraordinary career in reserve for Joseph, was within the place of his solitary restraint, and "gave him favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison. And the keeper of the prison committed to Joseph's hand all the prisoners that were in the prison; and whatsoever he did there he was the doer of it. The keeper of the prison looked not to any thing that was in his hand, because the Lord was with him; and that which he did, the Lord made it to prosper."

About this time two officers of Pharaoh's household had committed some grievous offence against their master, and were consigned to the prison in which Joseph was confined. Those officers are called the "chief butler" and the "chief baker" of the king, but properly speaking they were two important officers of the royal palace, and were, the one the cup-bearer, and the other the master of the household to the king. The offence for which they were sent to prison is not specified, but there is an incident related by Mr Morier which throws very considerable light on this part of the history. A Persian officer named Mirza Ahady was believed to have monopolized all the corn in the country in conjunction with the prince's mother, and as this produced a corresponding advance on the price of bread the people were outrageous. The inhabitants of Shiraz, where Mirza Ahady then was, resorted to the house of the Sheik-el-Islam, the head of the law, requiring him to issue a *fitnah*, making it lawful to kill the Mirza and some others whom they considered his coadjutors in oppressing them. The result of the commotion was, that the price of bread was lowered for a few days till the excitement subsided, and, as it was necessary that some satisfaction should be given to the people, all the bakers in the town were collected together, and publicly bastinadoed on the soles of the feet. "As the chief baker was dignified by the title of Mirza," says Mr Morier, "we may infer that *Pharaoh's chief baker was a person of equal dignity*, and no reason being assigned in Scripture why, after liberating the chief butler and chief baker from prison, the one should be restored to favour, and the other shortly after executed, perhaps what is usually thought an act of despotical caprice may be better explained by the necessity of appeasing popular clamour, which the alternate vicissitudes of famine and plenty in the Land of Egypt render more probable." This is a very valuable illustration of a historical incident in Scripture.

The "chief butler" and the "chief baker" had each dreams on the same night, for the interpretation of which the greatest anxiety was evinced. At the request of Joseph they severally related their dreams, which were connected with their several occupations in the royal household. The "chief butler," or cup-bearer, first recited his dream. "Behold," he said, "a vine was before me, and in the vine were three branches; and it was as though it budded, and her blossoms shot forth; and the clusters thereof brought forth ripe grapes: and Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh's cup, and I gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand." This early mention of the culture of the vine in Egypt contradicts the statement of Herodotus that it was unknown in that country, and every evidence confirms the intimation of Scripture; but the quantity of wine produced by the Egyptian vines was so small, that it never was, as in Greece, a common drink. If we are to understand the process described by Pharaoh's cup-bearer in his dream literally, wine could not have been produced by this mode of pressing, although the expressed juice of the grape is often by a poetical licence called wine. The juice which the cup-bearer produced, being mixed with water, would form a kind of sherbet—a drink which is not intoxicating, and to which the Orientals are extremely partial. It has been asserted that the use of wine was forbidden to the ancient Egyptians by their religion, but this must be understood with important limitations, for Herodotus tells us that the people were allowed to drink it at certain festivals; at the same time it must be observed that there was such a diversity of usages in the various provinces in that and other respects, that wine may have been entirely prohibited in some and partially allowed in others. But let us return to Joseph, who satisfactorily interpreted the dream to the cup-bearer. "The three branches," he said, "are three days: Yet within three days shall Pharaoh lift

up thine head, and restore thee unto thy place; and thou shalt deliver Pharaoh's cup into his hand, after the former manner when thou wast his butler." He added an earnest appeal in behalf of himself, entreating the cup-bearer to use all his influence for his release from prison. "But think on me when it shall be well with thee, and show kindness, I pray thee, unto me, and make mention of me unto Pharaoh, and bring me out of this house: for indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews, and here also have I done nothing that they should put me into the dungeon." There can be little doubt that the cup-bearer would make many solemn protestations to Joseph, assuring him that he would do him all the service in his power. Joseph says that he had been *stolen*, or illegally carried away, out of the *land of the Hebrews*. This refers to that particular part of Canaan where Isaac and Jacob had resided many years, and where, though they were not originally natives of the country, they possessed such numerous families, flocks, and herds, that they were held as "mighty princes," or powerful emirs, Gen. xliii. 6.

When the "chief baker," or master of the household, heard the favourable interpretation of his companion's dream, he proceeded to recite his own. "I also was in my dream, and, behold, I had three white baskets on my head, and in the uppermost basket there was of all manner of bakemeats for Pharaoh, and the birds did eat them out of the basket upon my head." Joseph, however, announced to him a very different fate. "The three baskets," he said, "are three days: Yet within three days shall Pharaoh lift up thy head from off thee, and shall hang thee on a tree, and the birds shall eat thy flesh from off thee." The interpretation of both dreams was verified within the time specified. The cup-bearer was restored to his office, and his unfortunate companion was put to death.

Yet "did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgot him." The cup-bearer in his prosperity forgot his pro-

mises, and Joseph languished in prison two years, supported only by the consciousness of his innocence and his confidence in God. He might have continued in this state longer, but the Providence of Jehovah was in operation, and Joseph was to appear in a remarkable manner as the instrument of the Divine purposes. Pharaoh himself had two dreams, by which, fearing they intimated, as they actually did, some great national events, his mind was much impressed. The royal dreams were in the highest degree symbolical. Pharaoh thought he stood by the Nile, and "there came up out of the river seven well favoured kine, and fatfleshed, and they fed in a meadow. And, behold, seven other kine came up after them out of the river, ill favoured and leanfleshed, and stood by the other kine upon the brink of the river. And the ill favoured and leanfleshed kine did eat up the seven well favoured and fat kine;" and "when they had eaten them up, it could not be known that they had eaten them, but they were still ill favoured as at the beginning." Pharaoh's other dream was equally significant. He slept, and, "behold, seven ears of corn came up upon one stalk, rank and good. And, behold, seven thin ears devoured the seven rank and full ears." The ox, in the symbolical writings of the Egyptians, signifies agriculture and subsistence, and the action of the oxen in coming up out of the water is what Pharaoh doubtless witnessed every day. All animals of the buffalo kind in hot countries delight to stand for hours in the water with their bodies immersed except the head, and they can swim broad and rapid rivers without reluctance or difficulty. The "seven ears of corn on one stalk" will be readily understood by those who are familiar with Egyptian produce. Mr Jowett tells us that when in Egypt he plucked up at random a few stalks out of the thick corn-fields. "We counted the number of stalks which sprouted from single grains of seed, carefully pulling to pieces each root, in order to see that it

was one plant. The first had seven stalks, the next three, then eighteen, then fourteen; each stalk would bear an ear."

In the utmost perplexity Pharaoh summoned the magicians of Egypt—men who professed to interpret dreams either by natural observations, by pretending to consult demons, by the art of astrology, or by certain superstitious characters, with peculiar rites and ceremonies. But they were unable to interpret the dreams of Pharaoh, and the king became the more disquieted. The cup-bearer now recollected Joseph in the prison, acknowledged to Pharaoh his ingratitude for neglecting him, and related the circumstances connected with himself and the chief baker. Joseph was instantly summoned to Pharaoh's presence, before whom he appeared in a suitable manner. The king imparted to him his dreams; and Joseph, having listened attentively to the recital, informed him that they were both connected with each other, and pointed to the same events—that they denoted seven years of great plenty, which would be succeeded by seven years of a famine unprecedented for its severity; at the same time he disclaimed any pretensions to superior merit, and ascribed his ability to interpret the dreams solely to God. "And for that the dream is doubled unto Pharaoh twice," said Joseph, "it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass. Now, therefore, let Pharaoh look out a man discreet and wise, and set him over the land of Egypt. Let Pharaoh do this, and let him appoint officers over the land, and take up the fifth part of the land of Egypt in the seven plentiful years, and let them gather all the food of those good years that come, and lay up corn under the hand of Pharaoh, and let them keep food in the cities. And that food shall be for store to the land against the seven years of famine, which shall be in the land of Egypt; that the land perish not through the famine." It is worthy of notice, Dr Wall observes, that this history of Joseph foretelling the seven

years of plenty and then seven years of famine, and of Egypt being preserved thereby, was remembered by the Egyptians, and told by them to Trogus Pompeius, from whom Justus recites it, without mentioning Joseph's name.

The king, thus duly forewarned, found it necessary to act on Joseph's suggestions. Moved by the Spirit of God, who had for specific purposes, and for the accomplishment of great events, brought the young Hebrew into Egypt, Pharaoh concluded that the man whose knowledge of futurity far excelled the pretensions of the magicians and other wise men of his court, and who had rendered him the most essential service of interpreting his dreams to his satisfaction, was the only one who could be entrusted with the management of his kingdom in the ensuing seasons of prosperity, which were to be succeeded by the direst sterility and desolation. Viewing Joseph with respect and admiration, he turned to his attendants, and inquired—"Can we find such an one as this is, a man in whom the Spirit of God is?" He then said to Joseph—"Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art. Thou shalt be over my house, and according unto thy word shall all my people be ruled; only in the throne shall I be greater than thou." He added—"See, I have set thee over all the Land of Egypt." Joseph was immediately invested with the insignia of his high office. Pharaoh "took off his ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen (or *silk*), and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had made, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the Land of Egypt." The most unlimited power was committed to him—no man in Egypt, whatever might be his rank, was to do any thing against Joseph's will. "I am Pharaoh," said the king, "and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the Land of Egypt."

Several observations occur respecting the ceremonies used in the investiture of Joseph in his high office, but as these all refer to Oriental usages which are repeatedly noticed elsewhere in the present work, it is unnecessary to repeat them here. The distinguished Hebrew was at this time thirty years of age, and on the occasion of his elevation Pharaoh, in conformity with an ancient custom among Eastern monarchs, of which we have several instances in the Scriptures, changed his name to *Zophnath-paaneah*, which means *a revealer of secrets*, or more probably *a prime minister*, or *the prince of Lords*. The king also gave him in marriage Asenath, the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest or prince of On or Heliopolis, whom some of the Rabbins and others strangely maintain to have been the Poti-phar who thrust Joseph into prison. Two sons were the offspring of this marriage, whose descendants formed two of the Twelve Tribes—Manasseh, "for," said Joseph, "God hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house"—and Ephraim, "for God hath caused me to be fruitful in the land of my affliction." Several explanations have been given respecting the impropriety of Joseph's marriage to the daughter of an idolater, and none of them very satisfactory. Whatever were the religious opinions of the priest of On, we may safely conclude that he was a member of that great priestly caste whose authority and influence were such as to render the ancient Egyptian government rather ecclesiastical than monarchical. When a king was elected who was not of the sacerdotal order he was adopted into it, and instructed in its science and mysteries. We are entitled to conclude, therefore, either that the priesthood wished Joseph to be connected with their order, it being their invariable object to concentrate all power in their own body, or the king may have wished that a person in whom he had the utmost confidence, and to whom he had confided the most important functions, should have their powerful support and countenance.

Joseph entered on the duties of his high office with zeal and resolution. He made a personal inspection of Egypt, surveying the whole country, and adopting proper measures to discharge his duties. He did not consider his advancement as intended to gratify pride and vanity, of which he was utterly divested, but he judged that he was chosen to act for the benefit of all, and to preserve life. The course of events was precisely as he had predicted in his interpretation of Pharaoh's dreams. In the seven plenteous years the "earth brought forth by handfuls," by which we are properly to understand that each stalk in the years of plenty produced as much corn as the hand could grasp—a productiveness which travellers inform us is not unusual even at the present day in Egypt. Granaries were established under Joseph's direction in the cities, and corn was collected in great quantities and laid up in store during those plenteous years, not only for the supply of Egypt, but of the neighbouring countries during the succeeding years of scarcity. The Delta teemed with grain for the sustenance of life, the noble Nile spread its fertilizing waters over the land, and the luxuriant produce diffused universal joy and happiness. Never had Egypt enjoyed seven years of such prosperity. Its inhabitants were either ignorant of the predicted famine which was to ensue, or, if aware, they forgot it amid the plenty which prevailed. It is likely, however, that the great mass of the people were unacquainted with the real causes of Joseph's promotion, and they viewed their new governor as one whose activity and wisdom had alone secured for him the favour of Pharaoh.

The seven years of famine began, according to the Hebrew computation, B.C. 1708. It was not confined to Egypt—the "dearth was in all the land," and "all countries came into Egypt to buy corn." That celebrated country was then, as it has continued to be to the present time, the granary of the surrounding nations, who in all their exigencies looked to it for supplies, and we have here the earliest

notice of the extensive corn trade which Egypt has always enjoyed, more particularly noticed by several historians when the Greeks and Romans became interested in it, and began to resort thither for corn. When the famine seized the astonished Egyptians—when they saw their crops fail, and the annual inundation of their river in vain removing the unprecedented sterility of a soil which it usually made richly productive, in seasons when the harvest failed in those other countries depending on the local rains—the people "cried to Pharaoh for bread," and he referred them to Joseph. The granaries were opened, and the corn was sold to the famishing Egyptians, who perceived the wise precautions of their governor in the ample supplies he had provided for their necessities.

It is now that the story begins to be developed, as connected with Jacob and his family. The famine was severe in the Land of Canaan, and in the general distress the Patriarch sent his ten sons to Egypt to purchase corn, retaining only Benjamin his youngest son with him from motives of attachment, as the supposed surviving son of his beloved Rachel. We at once perceive that the history of Joseph is a strong yet plain example of that peculiar providence of God, by which he accomplishes his purposes by seemingly casual and unsuspected means. Hitherto there had been nothing out of the common course of events in the progress of Joseph's advancement, and the history appears rather to us as a useful example of the protection and final reward of virtue, though for a season oppressed and calumniated, or carried through a series of distresses and misfortunes; yet how pregnant was the whole with the most momentous consequences not only to the descendants of Jacob, but to the Egyptians themselves. When the ten sons of the Patriarch made their appearance before Joseph he at once knew them, although they were completely ignorant that the powerful governor was that very brother against whose life they had conspired, and whom they had

barbarously sold as a slave to the Arab merchants. They "bowed down themselves before him with their faces to the earth," and by so doing they unwittingly fulfilled his dream, the relation of which had provoked their resentment. To prevent their discovery of him the more effectually, and probably to ascertain if they had any feelings of remorse for their past conduct, Joseph questioned them by an interpreter in an angry manner concerning their country, and being informed that they came from the Land of Canaan to buy food—a fact which he well knew, while at the same time he "remembered the dreams he had dreamed of them," he accused them of being spies, who had come to see the "nakedness of the land." We shall see in the subsequent part of the history that Joseph had apparently sufficient cause to justify his affected suspicion, and even at the present day a stranger is liable to this imputation in the East, more especially if he stop or turn aside to examine any remarkable object, or is seen in the act of writing, or taking sketches of any particular subject which may have attracted his attention. Joseph's brothers obviated the charge of being spies by giving an account of their father and their family; but he persisted in the accusation that they had come to survey the weakest and most unprotected parts of Egypt, as that country was liable to incursions on its frontier towards Palestine. They told him that they were the sons of one man, who had only another, the youngest, remaining with him, and it was not likely that he would send all his sons, with that exception, on such a dangerous enterprise, which would require the union and co-operation of all the powerful chiefs of Canaan to ensure its success. They mentioned that they had had another brother, but that he *was not*, intimating that he was dead. Joseph, however, affected not to regard their statements, and he "put them all together into ward three days," thus making them experience for three days, as Dr Hales appropriately observes, the sufferings he had undergone for three years,

and probably in the same prison. He at the same time intimated to them a course which they had it in their power to adopt—"By the life of Pharaoh, ye shall not go forth hence except your youngest brother come hither. Send one of you, and let him fetch your brother, and ye shall be kept in prison, that your words may be proved, whether there be any truth in you; or else, by the life of Pharaoh, ye are spies."

On the third day of their imprisonment Joseph summoned them before him, and addressed them in a mild and soothing manner, yet expressing his determination. "This do," he said, "and live, for I fear God. If ye be true men, let one of your brethren be bound in the house of your prison; go ye, carry corn for the famine of your houses, but bring your youngest brother unto me; so shall your words be verified, and ye shall not die." During this detention, or rather, perhaps, after the proposition was made to them, they began to accuse one another for their cruelty towards Joseph, twenty years before, and acknowledged that their distress was a just retribution for their conduct. Reuben added to their guilty convictions by reminding them that they had obstinately rejected his advice. "Spake I not unto you," he asked, "Do not sin against the child, and ye would not hear? therefore, behold, also his blood is required." All this was said in the presence of Joseph, who, still feigning himself a stranger to their language, heard their mutual reproaches with an emotion he could not suppress, for he "turned himself about from them and wept." He, however, recovered his composure, and Simeon, who is supposed to have been the principal aggressor in the conspiracy against him, was left as an hostage. To show that he was sincere in his resolution, he "took from them Simeon, and bound him before their eyes."

The rest were allowed to depart with an ample supply of corn. Orders had been given to put each one's money in his "sack's mouth," and this circumstance,

when it was discovered during their return to Canaan, greatly alarmed them, and they concluded that it was done to furnish a pretence for enslaving them when they next visited Egypt. They safely arrived at the residence of their father, and informed him of all their adventures, which Jacob heard with surprise and concern, more especially when he found that Simeon was left behind in custody, and that they were pledged to return with Benjamin. "Me have ye bereaved of my children," he exclaimed; "Joseph is not, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away; all these things are against me." Reuben expostulated with his father, and told him to kill his own two sons if Benjamin was not safely restored to him, but this was no consolation to the Patriarch, who replied in accents of bitterness, "My son shall not go down with you, for his brother is dead, and he is left alone; if mischief befall him by the way in the which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave."

The famine continued, and as the scarcity increased, the supply of corn procured by the Patriarch's sons was nearly exhausted. Jacob again requested them to proceed to Egypt, but Judah told him it would be of no use unless he consented to allow Benjamin to accompany them—that it would be taken as an insult, and their lives would probably be in danger. "The man," he said to his father, "did solemnly protest unto us, saying, Ye shall not see my face except your brother be with you. If thou wilt send our brother with us we will go down and buy thee food; but if thou wilt not send him we will not go down." Jacob reproved them for mentioning that they had a brother to the ruler of Egypt, but they replied—"The man asked us straitly of our state, and of our kindred, saying, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? and we told him according to the tenor of these words; could we certainly know that he would say, Bring your brother down?" Judah's remonstrance and positive pledge that he

would be answerable for Benjamin's safety at length induced the Patriarch to consent with great reluctance. He ordered them to take suitable presents for the ruler of Egypt, and to carry with them twice as much money as before, and having committed them to the blessing of Heaven he dismissed them.

When they arrived in Egypt they hastened to present themselves before Joseph, by whom they were kindly received, and hospitably entertained at a feast he had prepared expressly for them. They mentioned the discovery of the money in their sacks to Joseph's steward, declaring their innocence of the transaction, and tendering it to that officer, but he told them that "the God of their father had given them the treasure in their sacks' mouth." It is probable from his reply that Joseph had not only informed him confidentially who they were, but that he had been instructed in the knowledge of the true God. Simeon was released, and they were all treated with honourable distinction. Several circumstances occurred on this occasion which might have brought their brother to their recollection, such as Joseph's particular inquiries after their father, and his marked kindness and partiality to Benjamin, but they seem never to have had the slightest suspicion of his identity. No particular disclosure took place, and they were allowed to depart, with their sacks and money as before. It may be here observed, that there are two kinds of sacks noticed in the history of Joseph—one for the corn, and another for the baggage. Through all Asia, especially in Syria, every thing is carried upon beasts of burden, in sacks of wool covered in the middle with leather down to the bottom, and in these they inclose their effects done up in large parcels. This is the kind of sack intimated in Joseph's injunction to his steward—"Fill the men's sacks with food, as much as they can carry, and put every man's money in his sack's mouth. And put my cup, the silver cup, in the sack's mouth of the youngest, and his corn money." We are

not, therefore, to confound these sacks with the sacks of corn, otherwise we must understand that the sons of Jacob carried only one each out of Egypt, which is by no means likely. In the text now quoted we find Joseph ordering his steward to fill the sacks with food or victuals, as much as they could contain, which presupposes that they were different from those filled with corn. Josephus says that the cup was a golden one, but the text explicitly says it was silver. The Egyptians of rank had drinking vessels of gold and silver, while those of the common people were of copper. There is considerable difficulty in what is said about divination by this cup—"Is not this it in which my lord drinketh, and whereby he indeed divineth?" Perhaps this clause might be rendered, *and for which he would carefully inquire*, and this is consistent with the general character of Joseph. It is certain, however, though it is not probable that Joseph intended to convey any intimation of this nature to his brethren, that there was a sort of pretended divination by cups practised among the Egyptians, as among other Oriental people, and there is a very ancient tradition of a wonderful cup which exhibited all that was passing in the world. Divination by cups is still exhibited by legerdemain performers in our own country, and also by superstitious persons and impostors, when the latter wish to alarm or extort some discovery or compliance from the ignorant or the credulous.

Unconscious of the plan adopted by Joseph to stay them, and to make known to them who he was, the sons of Jacob set out on their return to their father amply provided with corn, but they had not proceeded far when they were followed by an officer, who charged them with ingratitude for the hospitality with which they had been treated, and with the crime of having abstracted his master's silver cup. The whole of them protested their innocence, alleging that they had no necessity to commit such an act, as they had abundance of money; and so

confident were they of the falsity of the accusation that they proposed a minute search, declaring that he with whom it was found ought to be put to death, and that they would all become slaves to the ruler of Egypt. The officer partly agreed to their proposal—"Now also," he said, "let it be according to your word; he with whom it is found shall be my servant, and ye shall be blameless." A diligent investigation of the sacks was commenced, the officer intentionally beginning with those belonging to the eldest brother, and to their inexpressible astonishment the cup was found in Benjamin's sack. They were all taken back to Joseph, who insisted on detaining Benjamin as a slave, informing the rest that they were at liberty to return home to their father. They were now placed in an unexpected difficulty. Remembering the reluctance with which their father had parted with Benjamin, and that they were the sureties for his return, they urged various pleas to procure his liberty. They saw at once that to proceed to Canaan without Benjamin would most certainly break the heart of their father, who would never survive such a calamity, and who would not give the slightest credit to their statements and representations. Joseph, however, was obdurate, and contrived to conceal the emotions by which he was agitated, while the unfortunate Benjamin said nothing in defence. At this crisis Judah became the advocate of his brother's liberty, and in an address of great beauty, which was delivered in the most affecting manner, he offered himself as a substitute for Benjamin, if the latter was permitted to return. He gave Joseph an account which must have been to him peculiarly interesting, because he was in some respects connected with it, and because it reminded him of his mother Rachel, and of Jacob's attachment towards himself while his brother Benjamin was a mere child, which had procured for him the resentment of his other brethren. Judah dwelt on Jacob's old age, and the extreme reluctance he had manifested to allow Benjamin to

accompany them—that he was certain their father would die if they returned without him, and that they would be guilty of bringing his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave. Joseph was overcome, and he could no longer conceal himself, or refrain from discovering himself to his brethren. He ordered all his attendants to leave the apartment, and he “wept aloud.” This part of the history of Joseph is wrought up with such incomparable beauty and pathos by the inspired writer, that it must suffer by an attempt to abridge it, or to relate it in different language, and no apology is necessary for transferring it to this narrative. “I am Joseph,” he said to his astonished brethren, and his first inquiry was after his venerable father. He told them to approach nearer to him, and they obeyed in silence, the recollection of their cruelty towards him agitating their minds, and making them appear as guilty criminals; yet with that magnanimity which distinguishes his conduct, he calms their troubled spirits by referring to the providence of God, and assuring them of his sincere forgiveness. “I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. Now, therefore, be not grieved nor angry with yourselves that ye sold me hither, for God did send me before you to preserve life. For these two years hath the famine been in the land, and yet there are five years in the which there shall neither be eating nor harvest; and God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God: and He hath made me a father to Pharaoh, and lord of all his house, and a ruler throughout all the Land of Egypt. Haste ye, and go up to my father, and say unto him, Thus saith thy son Joseph, God hath made me lord of all Egypt, come down unto me, tarry not; and thou shalt dwell in the Land of Goshen, and thou shalt be near unto me, thou, and thy children, and thy children’s children, and thy flocks, and thy herds, and all that thou hast; and there will I nourish thee,

for yet there are five years of famine, lest thou, and thy household, and all that thou hast, come to poverty. And, behold, your eyes see, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin, that it is my mouth that speaketh unto you. And ye shall tell my father of all my glory in Egypt, and of all that ye have seen; and ye shall haste, and bring down my father hither.”

The discovery being made, Joseph received his brethren, and particularly Benjamin, with expressions of the most affectionate and tender regard. He immediately acquainted Pharaoh with the arrival and recognition of his brethren, and with the circumstances of his father and his family. The king invited them to Egypt, and offered to settle them in the most fertile part of the country. Goshen was the district allotted to them, as being a district where they were less likely to offend the prejudices of the Egyptians, who held shepherds in abomination. Dr Hales gives us an historical statement, confirmed by Mr Faber, which illustrates the prejudices of the Egyptians at this period. In the reign of Thamus or Thammuz, Egypt had been invaded and subdued by a race of Cushite shepherds, who cruelly enslaved the whole country under a dynasty of six kings, until the native princes rebelled, and after a war of thirty years shook off the yoke, and expelled the Shepherds to Palestine, where they became Philistines, about twenty-seven years before Joseph’s administration. The cruelty and oppression which the Shepherd Kings exercised left an indelible sense of hatred upon the minds of the Egyptians; and as the tyranny which they had suffered was still fresh in their recollection, the fact is sufficiently accounted for that “every shepherd was an abomination” to them. Professor Heeren suggests that this peculiar aversion of the Egyptians was not so exclusively to rearers of cattle as such, as to the class who associated the rearing of cattle with habits and pursuits which rendered them equally hated and feared by a settled and refined people. The nomade tribes who

pastured their flocks on the borders or within the territory of Egypt did not in general belong to the Egyptian nation, but were of Arabian or Libyan descent, and the prejudice against them as nomads was superadded to that cherished against foreigners.

Joseph sent magnificent presents to his father, and bestowed marks of his consideration on his brethren by giving them "changes of raiment, but to Benjamin he gave three hundred pieces of silver and five changes of raiment." When they arrived in Canaan, and told their father that Joseph was alive and was governor of Egypt, he could scarcely credit the extraordinary intelligence. Under the influence and protection of the God of his fathers he accepted the invitation, and retired to Egypt with all his family. He was met by Joseph in Goshen, which formed the eastern barrier of Egypt towards Palestine and Arabia. Here they continued to reside till the exodus, cherished by Joseph, and becoming a numerous people.

The long duration of the famine drained the Egyptians of their money, and they were compelled to part with their cattle, their houses, their lands, and even their personal freedom for food. The whole kingdom of Egypt thus became by the management of Joseph the property of the crown, and all the people were reduced to the servile condition of bondsmen. The only exceptions were the priests, whose estates Joseph did not purchase, because the proprietors were the highest and most privileged class in the kingdom. The original owners being separated from each other, were dispersed throughout the country, that they might forget their interest in the estates they had lost, and prevented from forming combinations for regaining them. It has been perhaps justly observed, that Joseph's zeal for Pharaoh's interest made him overstep the bounds prescribed by sound policy and justice, and contributed to establish that despotism which proved most oppressive to his own descendants and those of his brethren. In the last

year of the famine Joseph announced to the Egyptians that they might expect a crop in the following year, and he enabled them to recommence their agricultural operations by distributing among them seed and cattle, and settling them on new lands; but he stipulated that in future the fifth part of their produce was to belong to the king, and that they were to appropriate the four-fifths to their own use. To this condition they willingly assented, and acknowledged his services during the famine in the most grateful manner:—"Thou hast saved our lives; let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants." This law remained in force several centuries, and the lands of the priests were the only exceptions from its operation.

In the year B.C. 1689, Joseph paid his last visit to his dying father, and placed before him the hopes of his house and family in the persons of his two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh. He delayed not to leave the greatness and splendour of the court of Pharaoh to wait at the deathbed of the venerable Patriarch, and nothing can be more solemn than the interview—more honourable and consoling, as Dr Paley remarks, to old age, or more expressive of the dignified piety of the best of sons and of one of the greatest of men. After the burial of Jacob with his fathers, Joseph and his brethren returned to Egypt. The latter, apprehensive that he would now retaliate the injuries they had done him when they sold him to the Arabian merchants, sent a messenger to him, informing him that it was their father's dying request that he would forgive them, and continue to afford them his protection. Joseph relieved them of all their suspicions and anxiety by repeated assurances of his affection and his concern for their welfare. This illustrious person survived Jacob about sixty years, and discharged the duties of prime minister of Egypt under six sovereigns during a period of eighty years. Before his death he summoned his brethren, and said to them—"I die, and God will

urely visit you, and bring you out of this land unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.' He made them pledge themselves by an oath that they would "carry up his bones from hence." This oath was to oblige their descendants to do so at the departure from Egypt. Joseph died in the hundred and tenth year of his age, B C. 1635. We are told that he was "embalmed, and put in a coffin"—which intimates the great veneration manifested towards him by the Egyptians. The Israelites observed his injunctions respecting the removal of his body, and carried it with them at their exodus, and during all their wanderings in the Wilderness. It was committed to the care of the tribe of Ephraim, who eventually buried it near Shechem, in the field which Jacob gave to Joseph a little before his death as his peculiar property. Jerome informs us that the Israelites erected a noble monument to his memory, which was to be seen in his time. Moses does not state what became of the other sons of Jacob, but Josephus asserts that they were all carried to Canaan, and buried at Hebron soon after they died. This is probable, and that the same was not done to Joseph's remains, instead of carrying them about during the forty years' sojourning in the wildernesses of Arabia Petrea, is doubtless explained by the circumstance that the Egyptians were unwilling to part with the bones of one who had been so great a benefactor.

The history of Joseph is one of the finest narratives in any language, and abounds with numerous practical illustrations of the utmost importance. He is exhibited to us as a distinguished example of rational piety, and of blameless and manly integrity. As a son he was dutiful and affectionate, as a brother kind and forgiving, as a subject and servant loyal and faithful, as a ruler discreet and benevolent;—in short, humanly speaking, Joseph is presented to us as one of the most faultless patterns for our imitation. His history has attracted the

notice of many learned and pious writers, who have done it ample justice, and made it the basis of numerous admirable works. On a review of the whole career of this illustrious Hebrew, we may reasonably ask, in the language of the Egyptian monarch, "Can we find such an one as this, a man in whom is the Spirit of God?"

The story of Joseph is related by Mahomet in the Koran different from the account of Moses; and the Moslems have books containing the supposed loves of Joseph and Zuleikah, the wife of Potiphar, who, they allege, was the daughter of Pharaoh. Joseph and Zuleikah are with them what the bridegroom and the spouse are in the Song of Songs. The Rabbins have numerous stories concerning Joseph's coffin. Some learned men have strangely contended that the Egyptians worshipped Joseph as Osiris, Apis, and Serapis, and also under the names of Hermes, Tammuz, and Adonis.

JOSEPH, the husband of Mary, the mother of our blessed Saviour, though in humble circumstances, and by profession a carpenter, was one of the last lineal descendants of the royal family of David, and hence he was addressed by the angel at the conception of the Virgin, "Joseph, thou son of David." His genealogy is given by St Matthew from Abraham downwards, who informs us that "all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations." At the conception of our blessed Saviour Joseph was not the husband of Mary, but simply espoused or betrothed to her, for among the Jews no woman was married unless she was first espoused; and it was usual for a considerable space to intervene, generally from six to twelve months, between the espousals and the marriage, yet the parties were held by the Law to be the same as actually married. It was also ordained that if a man had privately espoused a woman, the

marriage should afterwards be publicly celebrated. The titles of husband and wife are occasionally given in Scripture to persons who were only betrothed, as in the case of Jacob and Rachel, Gen. xxix. 21. It was while Mary was thus simply espoused to Joseph that the second Person of the glorious Trinity was, by the power of the Holy Ghost, "made of a woman, made under the Law," and came into our world in this miraculous way to be made a sin-offering for us, that "we might be made the righteousness of God in him." When Mary was "found with child of the Holy Ghost," her betrothed husband, who is called a "just man," namely, just in the strictest acceptation, and also righteous in the most extensive sense, "not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily." Joseph, says Jeremy Taylor, "being a just man, that is, according to the style of Scripture, a good and charitable man, found it was more agreeable to justice to treat an offending person with the easiest sentence (Dent. xxiv. 1), than to put things to extremity. Accordingly he purposed to put his spouse away privily, that he might preserve her reputation. In so doing he was a pattern of charity, and reads to us a rule for our deportment towards erring and lapsed persons, that we should treat them with meekness, not hastening their shame nor provoking their spirit, nor making their reformation desperate by harsh treatment." Joseph was restrained from following out his intentions by a Divine communication, in which the situation of his betrothed wife was satisfactorily explained. Few particulars are recorded of the history of Joseph by the Evangelical writers, but tradition has attempted to supply the deficiency by a number of idle tales and unsupported statements. According to Dr Lightfoot, it appears that St Matthew traces the genealogy of our Saviour through Joseph, who was his *supposed father*, and the reason is, that he was writing for the Jews, and tracing his *legal* descent from David, which legal descent was always

reckoned in the male line, and was therefore properly traced through the husband of his mother; and if, says Archdeacon Pott, it be objected that we lay too much stress on a supposed accommodation to the Jews in commending the Messiah to them by this genealogy, when the Evangelist knew that Joseph was only the reputed father of our Lord, the answer is, first, that, as foster-father, it was something to prove Joseph to be of the lineage of David, and therefore not exceptionable to the Jews; and, secondly, that by knowing this, it necessarily followed, as the Jews well understood, that Mary also, of whom Christ came according to the flesh, was of the same lineage, for the daughters of Israel were not permitted to marry out of their own tribe; at least, if this practice were not universal, as it is denied by some learned men to have been, yet it was so far usual as to form a presumptive evidence, which could only be set aside by proof to the contrary; and in the case of Mary, this was particularly enjoined, according to the law laid down concerning the daughters of Zelophebad, which obtained in all such cases afterwards. The case of Mary and her sister, who had no brother, was exactly similar to this. To revert to Dr Lightfoot, that learned writer observes that the genealogy of our Saviour given by St Luke is entirely different as far as David from that given by St Matthew. "Among the various methods," he says, "which have been proposed of explaining this, the most probable is, that whereas St Matthew traced the genealogy through Joseph, the husband of his mother, St Luke traces it through his mother. It is certain that Heli was not the natural father of Joseph, for St Matthew expressly tells us that *Jacob begot Joseph*, and it is therefore inferred that Heli was the father of Mary, and only father-in-law of Joseph. But it was never usual with the Jews to mention the names of females in their genealogies, and on this account Mary is not mentioned by St Luke, but is only intimated or included when the line is

commenced from her father Heli. The true import of this genealogy becomes more evident if we consider, as seems to be intended, the word *Jesus* to be understood at every step. Thus it is to be supplied. *Jesus*, as was *supposed*, the son of Joseph—*Jesus*, the son of Heli—*Jesus*, the son of Matthat, &c.—*Jesus*, the son of Seth—*Jesus*, the son of Adam—*Jesus*, the son of God. A style of genealogy precisely similar to this is used by Moses, Gen. xxxvi. 2, where it is stated—“Abolihamah, the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon,” where, as Anah is the name of a man, the meaning must be—Abolihamah, the daughter of Anah—Abolihamah, the daughter of Zibeon.” Dr. Lightfoot adds—“Thus it appears that St Luke, composing his Gospel for the use of the Gentiles, and intending to prove that Christ was the seed of the woman, necessarily reckons by the line of his mother Mary, the daughter of Heli. St Matthew, on the other hand, intending to deduce his legal descent from Abraham and David, reckoned by the line of Joseph, the espoused husband of Mary, through whom the legal descent was to be carried.”

Joseph is called a carpenter, and the word so translated means one who worked in iron, wood, or stone. It is, however, the ancient tradition of the Church that Joseph was a carpenter. Some, nevertheless, have alleged that he was a smith, others that he was a goldsmith or mason. Ambrose says that he was employed in felling and cutting trees, and in building houses. Many of the ancients believed that before he was espoused to the Virgin he had a wife named Escha. The Apocryphal Gospel of the Virgin's birth imports that he was old when he was espoused. Epiphanius states his age at four-score, and others think that he was obliged to marry her as being her nearest relation. It is believed that he died before our Saviour commenced his public ministry. His name is in very ancient martyrologies.

JOSEPH, “a rich man” of Arimathea, supposed to be the place where Samuel

was born, was a disciple of our Saviour, and the circumstance of his being a “rich man” is particularly mentioned to point out the singular fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah, that the Messiah would make his grave with the rich in his death. The completion of this was apparently improbable, for according to the Roman law the bodies of persons were left suspended in the open air, and the Jews usually buried their malefactors in some neglected place. Joseph went to Pilate, and “begged the body of Jesus.” It is probable that he wished to do as much honour to our Saviour as he was permitted at the time, and especially to preserve his dead body from being ignominiously treated by the Jews, like those of the malefactors crucified with him. The Roman governor complied with the request of this devout man, and Joseph wrapt the blessed body of the crucified Saviour in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own tomb, in which no person had before been interred—an excavation in a rock then without the city of Jerusalem, but now covered by the church of the Holy Sepulchre in the modern city. In the Greek Church the festival of Joseph of Arimathea is celebrated on the 31st of July, but it was not in the Roman Calendar till 1585.

JOSES is mentioned with James and Simon, who are called our Saviour's *brethren*. It has been the ancient and general opinion that by the *brethren* of our Saviour are meant the sons of Joseph, his mother's husband by a former wife; but Jerome, comparing the parallel passages together (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40; John xix. 25), infers that they were the sons of his mother's sister the wife of Cleopas, it being consistent with the language of the Jews to call consins by the name of brethren. JOSES was also the name of Barnabas, Acts iv. 36.

JOSHUA, JEHOSSUA, or OSNEA, the distinguished successor of Moses, and leader of the Hebrews into the Promised Land, was the son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, and was born in the Land of Goshen, B. C. 1536. The history of his wars and transactions is contained in the

Book which bears his name, and the period it embraces is variously stated by different chronologists at seventeen, twenty-seven, or thirty years, but about twenty-seven years is the period now usually received.

The original name of Joshua was *Hosca*, or *Oshea*, which Moses, whose minister he was, changed into *Jehoshua*, Exod. xxiv. 13; Numb. xiii. 16, and by contraction *Joshua*, or *Jeshua*, or *Jesus*, which is the Greek pronunciation, signifying *saviour*, Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8. This great man was therefore a type of Christ, as well as his illustrious predecessor Moses, both in his name and actions. At the period of the famous exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, Joshua was distinguished by his talents, his virtues, and his valour. He was taken into the confidence of Moses, and the first notice of him is on the occasion of the Amalekite war, when he was appointed leader of a chosen party to repel the attacks of the Amalekites during the march of the Hebrews from Mount Horeb to Mount Sinai. At that time he was about forty-four years of age, though he was designated a *young man*, Exod. xxxiii. 2. Even then he had been appointed by Jehovah to be the leader of the Israelites in the conquest of the Promised Land, as appears from the injunction of Moses to record in a book the aggression of the Amalekites and the decree of their extermination, and to rehearse it in the ears of Joshua, as a memorial to him and the future Judges, Exod. xvii. 14. Joshua was honoured with the privilege of accompanying Moses to Mount Sinai, and of remaining with him forty days, when the great legislator received directions for the future government of the Israelites and the laws written on the first tables of stone. He also accompanied Caleb and ten other persons who were deputed to examine the country of Canaan previous to its invasion by the Hebrews. The other spies returned with most unfavourable reports, and a rebellion against Moses was meditated, but Joshua and Caleb endeavoured to remove their apprehensions and to quell the commotion, by assuring them that "the

land which they passed through to search it is an exceeding good land"—"a land which floweth with milk and honey."—"Only," they continued, "rebel not ye against the Lord, neither fear ye the people of the land; for they are bread for us; their defence is departed from them, and the Lord is with us; fear them not." But this assurance had little effect on the turbulent Hebrews. They threatened to stone Joshua and Caleb, and their conduct excited the wrath of Jehovah, who declared that he would utterly extirpate them by pestilence, but this calamity was averted by the earnest intercession of Moses. Nevertheless, the ten deputies who brought the false report were cut off by the plague.

Joshua and Caleb were the only two persons, of the immense multitude who left Egypt, who were permitted to enter the Promised Land. When Moses was informed of his approaching dissolution, he entreated Jehovah to nominate a suitable successor—to "set a man over the congregation which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may bring them in, that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep without a shepherd." Moses was instructed to take Joshua, "a man in whom is the Spirit," and to lay his hand upon him, "and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation, and give him a charge in their sight." It was farther enjoined—"And thou shalt put some of thine honour upon him, that all the congregation of the Children of Israel may be obedient. And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim before the Lord; at his word they shall go out, and at his word they shall come in, both he, and all the Children of Israel with him, even all the congregation." This laying on of the hand of Moses was followed with an increase of the gifts of God, and the "honour," some of which he was ordered to put upon Joshua, intimates that the latter was to exercise a kind of authority as an associate in the

government of the Israelites. The great difference, however, between Moses and Joshua consisted in this—that Moses never applied to the high priest to know the will of God, for God spake to him Himself. We are told that Moses “did as the Lord commanded him,” and “he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge,” thus confirming him in the most solemn and public manner his successor.

Moses was commanded on this occasion to “charge Joshua, and encourage him, and strengthen him, for he shall go over before this people, and he shall cause them to inherit the land which thou shalt see.” It is accordingly stated that Moses “gave Joshua the son of Nun a charge, and said, Be strong and of a good courage, for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I swore unto them; and I will be with thee.” At the death of Moses, Joshua was in the eighty-fourth year, according to some, or in the ninetyeth year of his age, yet he was “full of the spirit of wisdom,” when he was commanded to pass the Jordan, before which the Hebrews lay encamped, and take possession of the Promised Land. On that occasion he received a Divine communication, assuring him of the most complete success in his conquests, and that “no man would be able to stand before him all the days of his life.” He was commanded to “be strong and of good courage,” not only against the idolatrous nations who were his external enemies, but also in steadily persevering to obey the Divine Will, and to enforce similar obedience in those who were placed under him:—“The book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein; for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.”

Joshua commenced his arduous undertaking with remarkable prudence, and a resolution to obey implicitly the Divine commands. The Hebrews lay encamped on the banks of the Jordan, and beyond that river they saw before them the

mountains, valleys, and plains of the country long promised to their fathers, which, said Jehovah to Joshua, extended “from the wilderness and this Lebanon unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea [the Mediterranean] toward the going down of the sun.” The Hittites are here particularly mentioned, probably to shew, as they were a very powerful people, and some tribes of them of the race of the giants, that the most terrible and formidable people would not stand before Joshua. The geographical boundaries here noticed may be generally stated as intimating the outlines of the country about to be invaded. From the Wilderness of Zin, the boundary on the south, and *this* mountain of Lebanon, so high that the top of it could be seen from the place where the Israelites lay, which was the boundary on the north, to the river Euphrates, which limited the extent of the dominions of the Israelites on the east in the days of David and Solomon, and to the Mediterranean Sea, which bounded it on the west, or towards the going down of the sun.

The various nations who inhabited Canaan are subsequently noticed in the narrative of the wars of Joshua. Many of them still retained a fearful remembrance of the miracles in Egypt and of the passage of the Red Sea, and the recent victories over Sihon and Og, kings of the Amorites, had greatly increased their apprehensions. Joshua, in preparing for his arduous undertaking, B.C. 1451, issued an order to the officers of the Hebrews to “pass through the host, and command the people, saying, Prepare you victuals, for within three days ye shall pass over this Jordan, to go in to possess the land, which the Lord your God giveth you to possess it.” The Jordan, the only barrier which separated the Hebrews from the Canaanites, was at that season, supposed to have corresponded to our month of April, greatly swollen, and its broad and deep channel was completely filled. Its breadth was nearly two hundred fathoms, and it

greatest depth about fourteen feet. In making the necessary arrangements, Joshua addressed himself to the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and to the half-tribe of Manasseh, informing them that though their territorial possessions lay on the side of the Jordan on which they were then encamped, yet they were to assist the other tribes in the conquest. "Your wives, your little ones, and your cattle, shall remain in the land which Moses gave you on this side Jordan, but ye shall pass before your brethren, armed [in the margin, *marshalled by five*], all the mighty men of valour, and help them; until the Lord hath given your brethren rest, as he hath given you; and they also have possessed the land which the Lord your God giveth them; then shall ye return unto the land of your possession, and enjoy it, which Moses the Lord's servant gave you on this side Jordan towards the sun-rising." Those tribes declared their readiness to obey Joshua in all his commands, and their willingness to go wherever he sent them, expressing their implicit confidence in him, and that whosoever rebelled, or would not obey him, would be put to death.

Previous to these injunctions Joshua had sent two men to act as spies, and to survey the district and city of Jericho, a place of great strength and importance, governed by its own king and the first object of attack in the invasion. This city, now represented by a poor village called Riblah, between three and four miles from the Jordan, stood in the Plain of Jericho, a portion of the great plain or valley through which the river flows, and that part of it which lies between the Jordan and the high mountains which enclose it on the west. Although now a complete desert, forsaken and neglected by man, it was anciently in the time of Joshua, and many centuries afterwards, densely peopled, and so highly cultivated that both Josephus and Justin describe it as the most fertile in Judea. The palm-trees of this district are mentioned in Scripture, where it is sometimes called the *city of palm trees*, and

its balsam-trees were celebrated throughout the East. The two spies gained admittance into the city, and lodged in the house of a woman named Rahab, who is designated a *harlot*. As this woman is honourably mentioned in the New Testament for her faith, and was afterwards married to Salmon, of the tribe of Judah, by which marriage she became an ancestress of our Saviour, a considerable anxiety has been evinced to rescue her name from the imputation which apparently rests upon her. This vindication is founded on the derivation of the word (*zonah*) rendered *harlot*, which, it is contended, ought not to be deduced from *zanah*, but from *zun*, which means to *nurish*, and therefore the word ought to be rendered *hostess*. Josephus and several Rabbinical authorities take this view of it, and the Chaldee paraphrast expressly intimates that her designation means *a woman who keeps an inn or place of public entertainment*. Stackhouse says—"It cannot be denied that in ancient times there was a great affinity between the business of an hostess and the life of an harlot;" but it may be observed, that in the East there are no such persons as hostesses. The caravanseras, or places of public entertainment in towns, furnish only empty lodging, and can scarcely be said to have even a host, while, if a stranger be accommodated in a private house, the lady of it, or any female in it, is never seen. The only woman, generally speaking, who possesses a house to which strangers can have access, is one who bears the stigma attached to the name of Rahab. The Jews assert that Rahab was ten years old when their fathers left Egypt—that she had followed evil courses during all the time of their sojourn in the Wilderness—and that after the destruction of Jericho she was married to Joshua himself, by whom she had daughters who became severally the mothers of Jeremiah, Hilkiah, Maasia, Hanameel, Shalhum, Baruch, Ezekiel, and a prophetess named Huldah. This is, of course, completely at variance with the real fact

but it is in one respect a most important and valuable testimony, because, as it has been appropriately observed, it shows that even the Jews thought that Rahab's faith and repentance rendered her worthy of being the wife of such a distinguished man as Joshua and the mother of prophets, and consequently worthy in their estimation of being the wife of Salmon, and the ancestress of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Jonah, and others, from all of whom our blessed Saviour in his human nature was lineally descended.

The spies sent by Joshua went to the house of Rahab, therefore, on account of its being a house where they would escape observation, and probably its advantageous situation appeared to them of the utmost importance, as it was built against the city-wall of Jericho, having a window towards the open country, and thus affording facilities for escape of which they afterwards availed themselves. The entrance of the spies into the city was, however, discovered by the inhabitants; they were recognized as strangers, jealousy was excited, their residence in the house of Rahab was known, and information was transmitted to the king of Jericho respecting them. It was even known who they were, for in the account of them given to the king it is said—"Behold, there came men in hither to-night of the children of Israel, to search out the country." The king immediately ordered Rahab to deliver them up, but she concealed them on the roof of her house, and covered them with stalks of flax, which "she had laid out in order upon the roof." To understand this statement, the reader will observe that in Eastern countries the houses have flat roofs, on which people walk, recline, and even sleep, and that those roofs are also still used for drying raisins, flowers, and other vegetable productions requiring to be dried in the sun, for which their full exposure to the air and their secure situation well adapt them. It has been alleged that what is called *flax* ought to be understood as *cotton*, but it is very improbable that cotton was cul-

tivated in Canaan at that early period, and we know that cotton is not gathered till the autumn, whereas we are expressly told that the time of the present transaction was early in the spring, when the Jordan was overflowed. Rahab admitted to the king's messengers that two men came to her house of whom she knew nothing, but that they had left her, and went out at the gate, and that she could not say in what direction they proceeded, although they might be overtaken if pursued diligently. The messengers never thought of examining the roof of the house, but commenced the pursuit as far as the fords of the Jordan, and after they had departed on their hopeless expedition the gates of the city were carefully shut.

The *falsehood*, for such it undoubtedly was, which Rahab told the officers of the king of Jericho on this occasion, has been explained by several learned writers. Dr Waterland observes, that in judging of Rahab's conduct we should remember that she had sufficient intimations of what God intended for his people, and she expressed her faith in Jehovah by saying, "The Lord your God, he is in heaven above, and in earth beneath"—that she was deeply sensible that the Lord of hosts had given the land of Canaan to the Israelites, and that she acted under this persuasion by assisting to deliver up the country to those whom God had made the rightful proprietors, and therefore the true owners, for which act of faith she is commended in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Stackhouse argues that, on the supposition of Rahab acting on this occasion in conformity with the intimation she had received of God's design towards the inhabitants of Canaan, her whole conduct is not only clear of every criminal intimation, but is highly honourable, and justly deserves a rank among those illustrious patterns which the Apostle St James (ii. 25) proposes to our imitation, as being a person not only justified by her faith but 'by her works. Shuckford gives us a matured view of the subject. He suggests the probability

that Rahab was informed by an express revelation of the will of God, and that she acted in obedience to it, otherwise she could not have been an instance of the faith commended in the Epistle to the Hebrews. If this learned writer argues, she had proceeded only on a *general report* that the people who were invading the country were raised up and supported by the miraculous power of God, her conduct, instead of being justified, would have been most treacherous, and might have been an unavailing as well as a wicked action. But, on the other hand, if the design of God towards the Canaanites was known by the king and people of Jericho, which seems to be intimated by the message sent by the former to Rahab, and if, though sufficiently warned to save themselves from destruction, they refused to be guided by the warning, while she believed, and obediently acted according to what was required of her, in that view her whole behaviour was such as entitled her to the honourable notice she receives in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

As soon as the officers of the king of Jericho had set out in pursuit of Joshua's spies, Rahab went up to the roof of her house where they were concealed, and told them that the passage of their nation through the Red Sea, and their victories over Sihon and Og, were events which had caused the greatest consternation among the Canaanites, and that she well knew that God had given them the country. "Now, therefore," she said, "I pray you, swear unto me by the Lord, since I have showed you kindness, that ye will also show kindness unto my father's house, and give me a true token; and that ye will save alive my father, and my mother, and my brethren, and my sisters, and all that they have, and deliver our lives from death." She then informed them that she would let them down by the window which looked towards the open country, and advised them to conceal themselves three days, until their pursuers had returned. It is remarkable that while Rahab so anxiously provides for the

safety of her relations she never mentions her husband and children, and as in the East few women but those of questionable reputation remain single, we have a strong testimony that the life of this woman is correctly described by the rendering in our version. The spies solemnly swore as she requested. "We will be blameless of this thine oath which thou hast made us swear. Behold, when we come into the land thou shalt bind this line of scarlet thread in the window which thou didst let us down by; and thou shalt bring thy father, and thy mother, and thy brethren, and all thy father's household, home unto thee. And it shall be, that whosoever shall go out of the doors of thy house into the street, his blood shall be upon his head, and we will be guiltless; and whosoever shall be with thee in the house, his blood shall be on our head if any hand be upon him. And if thou utter this our business, then we will be quit of thine oath which thou hast made us to swear." Rahab replied—"According to your words, so be it;" and she let them down by a rope from the window, "and she bound the scarlet line in the window." This was a scarlet coloured rope, and probably the same by which the spies effected their escape. As this was to be a sign by which Rahab's house was to be recognized when the city was sacked, it must have been conspicuous enough to have been easily distinguished by those who were acquainted with its purport. Having rendered this essential service to the spies, they acted according to her recommendation, and concealed themselves three days among the mountains, until their pursuers had returned from their fruitless pursuit. They then proceeded to the camp, and informed Joshua of their proceedings. "Truly," they said, "the Lord hath delivered into our hands all the land, for even all the inhabitants of the country do faint because of us."

Joshua had made his arrangements about invading the country, and had selected from the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, whose

cantonments lay on that side of the Jordan where the Hebrews then were encamped, and the other tribes, forty thousand of the ablest warriors to act in concert, the rest being appointed to defend the women, children, and flocks. It is already stated that the Jordan was greatly swollen, and it appears that the Canaanites, thinking it impossible for such a numerous people to cross the river at that time with their wives and children, took no measures to obstruct or prevent the execution of such a design. Early in the morning of the day appointed by Joshua for passing the Jordan, the Israelites struck their tents in Shittim, in the Plains of Moab, a few miles distant from the Jordan, where they had lain encamped about two months, and marched to the banks of the river. An order was given to the people, which they were commanded rigidly to observe:—"When ye see the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, and the priests the Levites bearing it, then ye shall remove from your place, and go after it. Yet there shall be a space between you and it, about two thousand cubits by measure; come not near unto it, that ye may know the way by which ye must go; for ye have not passed this way heretofore." The Kohathites had generally the charge of the ark, but the priests were appointed to it on this occasion. The ark, which in the former marches of the Hebrews was in the middle of the camp, was appointed to lead and direct their course in front, in the same manner as the cloud of glory, which had now left them, used to do; and as the cloud was at some distance before the camp, it was now ordered that the ark should be followed at the distance of two thousand cubits (about eight hundred or a thousand yards), as the only remaining symbol of the Divine guidance through the unknown passages of the inundated river. The Hebrews were farther commanded to prepare themselves, by the means usual on extraordinary occasions, for receiving the benefits to be bestowed upon them with proper feelings and meditations. "Sanctify

yourselves," said Joshua, "for to-morrow the Lord will work wonders among you." The observances are recorded by Moses:—"And the Lord said unto Moses. Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes," *Exod. xix. 10*; and again, "Sanctify yourselves against to-morrow, and ye shall eat flesh," *Numb. xi. 18*. Although in the latter instance the word *sanctify* means no more than that the Hebrews were to prepare and make themselves ready to receive what they desired, it generally indicates that they were to abstain from their usual employments and lawful pleasures, and give themselves to fasting and prayer, that they might be the more capable of appreciating the mighty works of God.

On the morning of the important day when the Jordan was to be crossed, and the Hebrews were to enter the country of Canaan, Joshua received the Divine instructions, and he made an address to the Hebrews, in which he told them that Jehovah would "drive out from before them the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Hivites, and the Perizzites, and the Gergashites, and the Amorites, and the Jebusites," and he announced to them the wonderful miracle which was to happen of the separation of the waters of the Jordan, and their passing over after the ark in the channel of the swollen river, that they might not ascribe it to any accidental cause, but solely to God's power and providence. "Now, therefore," he said, "take you twelve men out of the tribes of Israel, out of every tribe a man; and it shall come to pass, as soon as the soles of the feet of the priests that bear the ark of the Lord, the Lord of all the earth, shall rest in the waters of Jordan, that the waters of Jordan shall be cut off from the waters that come down from above; and they shall stand upon an heap." This great event took place on the tenth day of the first month, when it wanted only five days to complete the forty years from the day when the Hebrews left Egypt. We are told in a supplied clause (*Josh. iii. 15*), that

"Jordan overfloweth all his banks all the time of harvest." This is meant of *barley-harvest*, which began about the time of the Passover, when the river is swollen by the melting snow from the neighbouring mountains. Few, if any, recent travellers have seen the Jordan in its state of overflowing. It is known that this river has what may be called two banks, the outer of which is undoubtedly that to which the inundation reaches, and travellers, after descending from this outer bank, must proceed on the level strand to come to the inner or immediate bank of the river. The existence of this outer bank, therefore, is a conclusive proof of the occasional overflowing of the river, and as the swelling of the stream was rare, and the security of the Canaanites increased by it, the passage of the Israelites must be held as an undoubted and illustrious instance of Divine interposition. We are told that "the waters which came down from above stood, and rose up upon an heap, very far from the city Adam, that is beside Zaretan; and those that came down toward the Sea of the Plain, even the Salt Sea, failed, and were cut off; and the people passed over right against Jericho. And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until all the people were passed clean over Jordan." Such was the great event of the passage of the river, which seems to have been made in this manner: The priests bearing the ark, at the distance of two thousand cubits from the host, marched onward in full reliance on the Divine promise to enter the river, and no sooner did their feet touch the waters than these divided from shore to shore. The stream descending from above stood still at the point where the priests entered with the ark, and the water which had already passed continued to flow onwards to its depository, the Dead Sea, leaving all the channel of the river open between the Dead Sea and the point of separation. The current

was consequently "driven back," as the Psalmist expresses it, and the inundation along the banks above the point of separation would be greatly increased until a convenient retreat was found in the Lake of Gennesaret, called in the time of Joshua the Sea of Cinneroth. As the sites of the cities of Adam and Zaretan cannot be determined, it is impossible to state what extent of channel was laid open, but from a reference to the situation of Gilgal, where the Israelites after crossing formed their first encampment, it may be estimated at about seven miles. This is not overstated, when it is considered that it must have taken a considerable space as well as time for such a vast multitude, with their women, children, and baggage, to pass over. The river Jordan at this part is ascertained to have a firm pebbly bed, over which the Hebrews could pass without inconvenience after the water had been cleared away. It is to be farther observed that the priests, having entered first, stood still in the mid channel with the ark interposed between the people and the suspended waters, the host passing over the cleared channel between them and the Dead Sea, and when all had passed the priests went up with the ark out of the channel. As soon as they left it, the waters of the river suspended above returned to their place, overflowed the banks as before, and resumed their course to the Dead Sea, with which they have mingled undisturbed since the remarkable event now described. On a consideration of the whole of this most impressive transaction, we may well observe with Dr Hales—"The passage of this deep and rapid though not wide river, at the most unfavourable season, was more manifestly miraculous, if possible, than that of the Red Sea, because here was no natural agency whatsoever employed, no mighty wind to sweep a passage as in the former case, no reflux of the tide on which minute philosophers might fasten to depreciate the miracle. It seems, therefore, to have been providentially designed to silence cavils respecting the former, and

it was done in the noon-day, in the face of the sun, and in the presence, we may be sure, of the neighbouring inhabitants, and struck terror into the kings of the Amorites and Canaanites westward of the river, whose 'heart melted, neither was there spirit in them any more, because of the children of Israel.'

It appears that the Jordan continued dry a little time after the people passed over, while the priests remained with the ark in the channel, for we find Joshua, in obedience to the Divine command, immediately issuing an order to the Hebrews—"Take you twelve men out of the people, out of every tribe a man, and command ye them, saying, Take you hence out of the midst of Jordan, out of the place where the priests' feet stood firm, twelve stones, and ye shall carry them over with you, and leave them in the lodging place, where ye shall lodge this night." The meaning of this injunction is obvious—they were to take twelve great stones, as large as they could lift, from that part of the channel of the river on which the priests stood, and carry them to Gilgal, their first encampment on the west of the Jordan, where they were to remain that night. It appears that these stones were to be preserved, for we find Joshua telling the people that this was to be "a sign among them," and instructing them—"When your children ask their fathers in time to come, What mean ye by these stones? Then ye shall answer them, That the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord; when it passed over Jordan, the waters of Jordan were cut off; and these stones shall be for a memorial unto the children of Israel for ever." This was done, and we are farther told that "Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the feet of the priests which bare the ark of the covenant stood, and they are there unto this day," namely, at the time when the Book of Joshua was written. As it is difficult to discover what purpose these twelve stones could answer under the water, and as in the

Divine command given to Joshua there is nothing said about these stones to be set in the middle of the river, various conjectures have been offered to explain the meaning. Some think that the stones were placed one above each other so as to appear above water, or when the water was low, but it is evident that if this had been the case such a loose heap would have been soon swept away by the rapidity of the stream. In some ancient translations the passage, by an alteration in a letter of the Hebrew text, reads—"Joshua set up twelve stones *from out* of the midst of Jordan, *from under* the place" where the priests stood; the Arabic version omits the verse altogether; and the Syriac, which is adopted by Kenicott, reads the verse as referring to the stones taken out of Jordan, making it a continuation of the description of the manner in which Jehovah's commands were fulfilled—"Thus Joshua set up the twelve stones which they had taken from the midst of Jordan." Josephus seems to have had no notion of any more than one monument set up on this occasion. It is, however, possible that the rendering in the authorized version is correct, although we do not clearly understand it; and perhaps the stones were not intended to be visible, but merely to replace those which had been taken out of the channel. The place where the Hebrews were supposed to have passed the Jordan was in our Saviour's time called *Bethabara*, or the *Place of Passage*. As it respects the twelve stones, we are told that Joshua "pitched" them in Gilgal. Josephus tells us that an altar was constructed with them, and as the stones were larger singly than one man could carry, the statement is not improbable. It was a custom among the Israelites, of which we have numerous intimations in Scripture, to set up stones as memorials of remarkable places and extraordinary events, and in the present case, if the twelve stones taken from the bed of the Jordan did not form an altar, they might have a distinct reference to the relationship of the Twelve Tribes.

Having passed the Jordan in this miraculous manner, the Hebrew leader selected forty thousand to prepare for war from the two tribes of Reuben and Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh. The passage of the Jordan made a deep impression on all "the kings of the Amorites which were on the side of the Jordan westward, and all the kings of the Canaanites which were by the [Mediterranean] sea." They appear to have become completely paralyzed at the appearance of the invaders, who were allowed to encamp without molestation not far from Jericho. The Hebrews, however, took no immediate advantage of the panic of the Canaanites, but gave them time to recover themselves. Instead of laying siege to Jericho, Joshua was first ordered to circumcise all those who had remained uncircumcised during the last forty years on account of the hardships of their journey, which are expressly stated as the causes of the omission of the rite. The Hebrews on the present occasion gave a remarkable proof of their faith in submitting to this painful operation in the face of their enemies, relying on the Divine protection till they were healed, for Gilgal was within less than an hour's march of Jericho. The conduct of Joshua plainly indicates that he acted according to the injunctions of Jehovah, as the history informs us. He was in an unknown country, where the people, who had hostile nations to encounter, must necessarily be kept active and vigilant, yet he made the whole army, or at least the greater portion, undergo an operation which made them incapable of acting, and put them in a position for a short time which exposed them to be cut to pieces by their enemies. The Hebrews kept the Passover at Gilgal, when the manna ceased which had been their constant food nearly forty years, and "they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year." On this occasion also a mysterious person appeared to Joshua with a drawn sword in his hand. The Hebrew warrior, who took him to be an ordinary man,

instantly challenged him—"Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?" "Nay," was the reply, "but as captain (or *prince*) of the host of the Lord am I now come"—which may denote the angels of heaven, and also the whole body of the Jewish people, whom God led forth from Egypt. Joshua fell on his face, and inquired, "What saith my lord unto his servant?" The answer was—"Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy." Nothing farther is recorded of this interview, unless we are to understand that the instructions to Joshua respecting Jericho were given on this occasion and by this mysterious person, which seems to be the opinion of several commentators. Adopting this view, there are several reasons to warrant that this mysterious person who appeared in human form was a Divine Being. Besides his own assumption of *captain of the host of the Lord*, he is expressly called Jehovah or the Lord in the continued narrative at the commencement of the following chapter, and the worship rendered by Joshua without being reproved for doing him too much honour, but rather a command to do him more, by loosing his shoe from his foot, is a certain evidence of the divinity of his person. And hence it was the opinion of the ancient Jewish Church that he who thus appeared, and called himself the captain of the Lord's host, was no other than the Eternal Word, who made the ground holy whereon he stood. "The design of this appearance," says Bishop Watson, "was to assure Joshua that the same God who had appeared to Moses, ordering him to pull off his shoes, because he stood on holy ground, had now appeared to him, and to serve as an encouragement to him in the war in which he was about to engage with the nations—as a confirmation of his faith, and as a lesson to him to obey in all things the commands of God, and to give the glory of his conquests to the Author of them, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."

The first remarkable transaction to which we are introduced in the history

of the conquest of Canaan is the siege and destruction of Jericho. Joshua had closely invested that city when the Divine Person appeared to him now mentioned, and instructed him to this effect—"Ye shall compass the city, all ye men of war, and go round about the city once. Thus shalt thou do six days. And seven priests shall bear before the ark seven trumpets of rams' horns, and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets. And it shall come to pass, that when they make a long blast with the ram's horn, and when ye hear the sound of the trumpet, all the people shall shout with a great shout, and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall ascend up every man straight before him." It thus appears that instead of a regular siege the Israelites were commanded to use only some particular circumstances and forms, which would show more plainly the subversion of that stronghold of the Canaanites to be from the miraculous hand of God; but we may suppose that the people of Jericho had previously refused offers of peace, which God directed the Israelites to make to their enemies. As to the "trumpets of rams' horns" (*keren ha-jobel*), it is certain that *keren* means a horn, or an instrument in the shape of a horn, but it is doubtful whether *jobel* means a ram. The word is used in the Book of Exodus (xix. 13), to denote the instrument with which the jubilee was proclaimed, and it is agreed that the same instruments were employed on the present occasion. The Rabbins positively assert that rams' horns were employed on both occasions, and as the horn of some animal is indicated, it must have been that of either an ox or a ram. Bochart and others contend that there never were any trumpets of rams' horns, the inside being solid, and therefore unsuitable for the purpose, but this statement is incorrect, for the inside of a ram's horn is not hard, and may be easily taken out, except about four or five inches at the point, which being cut off, and a

hole bored through the remainder, the solidity becomes an advantage. Trumpets thus made were, and probably still are, used by the shepherds in the south of Germany.

Jericho was taken in the manner recorded. At the last sound of the trumpet on the seventh day "the people shouted with a great shout, and the wall fell down flat," or rather *fell under the city*, as the Hebrew expresses it, which intimates that the foundations of the wall were subverted, and it sunk and fell into the ditch. The entire wall did not fall or sink, for Rahab's house was upon part of it, and it was preserved entire, but such wide breaches were made every where that the Israelites went straight forward, and found an easy entrance into the city. The assailants "utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword." Rahab, however, and her friends, were saved, and brought to the camp—the city was destroyed by fire, "only the silver, and the gold, and the vessels of brass and of iron, they put into the treasury of the house of the Lord." Joshua pronounced a curse on the man who should rebuild Jericho, which was signally verified between five and six centuries afterwards in the case of Hiel the Bethelite. The case before us is a most striking instance of a solemn *bann* or *cherem* operating against a city which was previously devoted to God, when it was intended to proceed with extreme severity. In such cases all the inhabitants were put to the sword, and "sequestered" as Bishop Hall quaintly expresses it, "to a revenge and extirpation from the Lord"—the beasts were slain—what would not burn was added to the treasury of the sanctuary, every thing else was destroyed—no booty was made by any Israelite, and an imprecation pronounced upon any attempt to rebuild it. In the ancient history of other nations we find numerous instances of prohibitions to rebuild a city destroyed in war, with imprecations against those who attempted its restoration.

In the case of Jericho, an order had been given in accordance with the spirit of the *cherem* or *bann*—"And ye, in any wise keep yourselves from the accursed thing, lest ye make yourselves accursed, when ye take of the accursed thing, and make the camp of Israel a curse, and trouble it." This strictly prohibited the preservation of any plunder on the part of the Israelites, and the disobedience of this special injunction was a capital crime. During the sack of Jericho a case had occurred of this description. Achan, or, as Josephus calls him with more propriety, Achar, of the tribe of Judah, had transgressed the command, and had secretly appropriated to his own private use some of the spoils which were either devoted to destruction, or devoted to the treasury of the sanctuary. After destroying Jericho, Joshua sent a detachment of about three thousand men to take the little fortified city of Ai, about three leagues nearly north from Jericho, and situated on rising ground which sloped down to the extensive plain through which the Jordan runs to the Dead Sea. The Hebrew detachment proceeded to invest the place, but they were attacked by the inhabitants of Ai, and completely routed with the loss of thirty-six men. This disaster struck the main army with consternation, the "hearts of the people melted, and became as water," and Joshua "rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face before the ark of the Lord until the even tide, he and the elders of Israel, and put dust upon their heads." The defeat seemed to them so utterly irreconcilable with the repeated assurances of victory given by Jehovah, that they could not account in any way for the promised aid being withheld, and Joshua was well aware that any disaster, however trifling, would encourage the numerous enemies against whom the Israelites had to contend, and who had hitherto beheld resistance hopeless. Michaelis regards this insignificant loss as a proof that there was no judicious organization among the invading Israelites in military affairs, but we are to ob-

serve that they were nomades fresh from the desert, and, moreover, that they had never been taught to place any reliance on numbers or military skill, but it was specifically intimated to them that they would only be invincible with the Divine assistance promised to them. Of this they had beheld at least two convincing proofs in the miraculous passage of the Jordan and in the siege of Jericho, and the forfeiture of this promised Divine assistance was to them a matter of vital consequence. The loss of the Israelites was indeed trifling, but it was one which, considering their circumstances, was well calculated to excite alarm. Burckhardt gives us an excellent illustration of the feeling of the Israelites on this occasion in the case of the Bedouins of Arabia, which is a most satisfactory answer to any critical objection such as that stated by Michaelis. "There is one circumstance which greatly favours the chance of a foreign general in his contest with the Bedouins. They are but little accustomed to battles in which much blood is shed. When ten or fifteen men are killed in a skirmish, the circumstance is remembered as an event of great importance by both parties. If, therefore, in a battle with foreign troops several hundreds are killed at the first onset, and if any of their principal men should be among the slain, the Bedouins become so disheartened that they scarcely think of making farther resistance, while a much greater loss on the side of their enemies could not make a similar impression on mercenary soldiers. But even the Arabs would only feel this impression at the beginning of a severe contest, and they would soon, no doubt, accustom themselves to bear greater losses in support of their independence than they usually suffer in their petty warfare about wells and pasture grounds."

In the deepest distress Joshua addressed Jehovah, confessing his ignorance of the cause of this disaster, and lamenting the inevitable destruction which must await the Israelites, if the promised Divine assistance was withdrawn. Lord

Clarendon finely observes on Joshua's address to Jehovah—"If those who had experienced so many miracles of God's mercies, and were the peculiar people whom he vouchsafed to love, should be driven back by a nation which knew not or cared not for his name or religion, Joshua could not see how God's honour could be preserved. From such jealousy and apprehensions proceed all the passion and impatience which pious and good men express in great calamities, for this will always be a prevailing mode of reasoning, as it was in the days of Joshua. There will always be too many who will question God's providence from what he suffers his children to undergo." Joshua was informed in reply of the reason of the defeat of the Israelites, and that the crime of sacrilege had been committed, aggravated by theft and dissimulation. The discovery of the offender and his punishment were necessary to avert the wrath of Jehovah, and Joshua was instructed how to proceed. Although it is not expressly stated, it is probable that the discovery was made by lot, and Achan was found to be the offender. He confessed his crime, and admitted that "when he was among the spoils a goodly Babylonish garment, and two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight, he coveted them," and that they were hid in the earth under his tent. The unfortunate Achan and his family were stoned to death in the valley of Achor, at no great distance from Jericho, and their dead bodies, with his flocks, goods, and all he possessed, including the articles he had appropriated, were consumed in the same valley, and a heap of stones was raised to commemorate the event.

Ai was soon afterwards taken by stratagem, but as there was no *cherem* or ban pronounced against it, the Israelites were allowed to divide the spoils. The inhabitants were put to the sword, the king was taken and ignominiously executed, and the city was destroyed by fire. It appears, however, that it was afterwards rebuilt and occupied by the He-

brews, for we find it mentioned in the Books of Ezra (xi. 28) and Nehemiah (vii. 22) that people of Bethel and Ai were among the number of those who returned from the Babylonish Captivity. Joshua erected an altar on Mount Ebal, in obedience to the injunction of Moses—"an altar of whole stones, over which no man had lift up any iron," and he convened the whole host of Israel, one half of whom he stationed on Mount Ebal, and the other on the opposite mountain of Gerizim, to hear read "the blessings and the cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the Law."

The progress and success of Joshua now excited the serious alarm of the Canaanitish nations, and six kings formed a powerful combination against him. The extraordinary number of kings mentioned in the Book of Joshua and in other parts of Scripture will occasion no surprise to the attentive reader of the sacred books, or of ancient history in general. It is well known that the earliest sovereignties were of exceedingly limited extent, and in most cases consisted of a single town with the small surrounding district. We subsequently find Joshua overthrowing thirty-one kings in the small country of Canaan, and in the Book of Judges we are introduced to Adoni-bezek, a conqueror who had overcome no fewer than seventy. Small states of this description have existed in the early period of almost every nation—in ancient Greece, for example, as we find from the number of kings sent by Greece and its islands to the Trojan War; in Gaul, Spain, and Germany, in the time of the Romans—in England, previous to and even after the invasion of Julius Caesar—in Germany at the present time; and in Africa, America, and part of Asia, we encounter numbers of sovereigns of independent states in a small extent of country. The combination formed against Joshua consisted of the petty kings of the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, who were "in the hills and in the valleys," and in all the coasts of the Great

Sea over against Lebanon." In this excited state of the country the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim, artfully obtained an alliance with the victorious Israelites, which multiplied the embarrassments of the Canaanites in the south of Palestine. Gibeon was an important city not far from Ai, and a few miles west from Bethel, being, according to Eusebius and Jerome, a royal city, and the capital of the Hivite Canaanites; but it is to be observed that no king of Gibeon is mentioned, and it is probable that it was the head of a confederacy or commonwealth, of which the other towns above enumerated were members, the inhabitants of the four receiving the general designation of Gibeonites. The deception practised by these Gibeonites on Joshua to obtain an alliance with the Israelites displayed considerable ingenuity. Presuming on his ignorance of the country and its localities, and afraid that their proposals would be rejected if they candidly admitted that they dwelt in cities within sight of the Hebrew encampment, they sent a deputation, who pretended they were ambassadors from a distant country, the inhabitants of which had no connection with the doomed nations of the Canaanites. To render the deception unsuspected, they took "old sacks upon their asses, and wine bottles, old and rent, and bound up." These were of course skin bottles, in which the Oriental nomades keep their water, milk, and other liquors, and when these bottles are old and much used, they repair them either by sewing in a piece, or by gathering up the broken place in the manner of a purse. The Gibeonites appeared with shoes which seemed to have been worn by long travel, and patched, for in the East a poor traveller who has only one ass to carry himself and baggage frequently dismounts, and walks a considerable part of the way to relieve the animal. They had also bread "dry and mouldy," and this apparently indicates not the bread commonly used in the East, which, being calculated to last only for

the day on which it is baked, soon becomes hard and unfit for use, but a kind of bread which will keep a considerable time, though it does ultimately become dry and mouldy—a kind of biscuit almost exclusively used by travellers, described as firm and rather crisp when new, but becoming gradually hard, and at last mouldy from the moisture left in it by baking. In this condition the ambassadors of the Gibeonites appeared before the Hebrew camp at Gilgal, and in an interview with Joshua succeeded in obtaining an alliance of peace on the pretence that they had come from a distant country, where they had heard of the name of the God of Israel, and "the fame of him, and all that he did in Egypt, and all that he did to the two kings of the Amorites, that were beyond Jordan, to Sihon king of Heshbon, and to Og king of Bashan, which was at Ashtaroth." As a proof of this pretended journey, the Gibeonites produced their dry and mouldy bread, which they alleged they "took hot" from their houses on the day they set out—their skin bottles of wine, now torn or burst by the long journey, and they pointed to the wretched condition of their garments, destroyed by the severe travel they had voluntarily undertaken, to secure the friendship of the Israelites. If this representation had been really true it would have been in the highest degree complimentary to the Hebrews, and a proof that the "fear" of them had fallen on even distant nations. In this way it was received, for the Hebrew elders "took of their victuals, and asked not counsel at the mouth of the Lord; and Joshua made peace with them, and made a league with them, to let them live, and the princes of the congregation swore unto them."

The Gibeonites, having thus gained their object, continued in the encampment of the Israelites, who little suspected that they had been egregiously deceived in the whole transaction; but on the third day after the ratification of the treaty the imposition was discovered, and it was found that, instead of having come

from a distant country, they were actually connected with a city only a short march from the camp. The elders of the Israelites saw that they had involved themselves in a dilemma which was a just consequence of their neglecting to "ask counsel at the mouth of the Lord," in the very first treaty of alliance they had occasion to make, and great dissatisfaction prevailed against them among the tribes. A council was held in which the elders intimated to the people—"We have sworn unto them by the Lord God of Israel; now therefore we may not touch them. This we will do to them: we will even let them live, lest wrath be upon us, because of the oath which we sware unto them." The elders then decided—"Let them live; but let them be hewers of wood and drawers of water unto all the congregation; as the princes had promised them." Joshua summoned them before him, and after reproving them for the deception they had practised he declared their future condition—"Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall none of you be freed from being bondmen, and hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God." It is previously said, "for the whole congregation," and some of the Rabbins understand that while the Israelites remained in the camp, before the land was divided, the Gibeonites performed this service for the whole of the people. This may have been the case, but it is nowhere so intimated, and even the Rabbins admit that their services were afterwards limited to the sanctuary. This was in reality the real duty to be required from them. They were not to furnish wood and water to the Israelites for the private use of each person or family, but they were only to relieve the congregation by undertaking its duty of furnishing those necessities, which were required for the service of the sanctuary, and which must have been onerous at the great festivals, though the whole of them were not and could not be required on such occasions. They appear to have been reduced to the con-

dition of domestic tributaries rather than of domestic slaves, and we may conclude that they enjoyed their private property and had other advantages. So diligently and faithfully do they appear to have discharged the duties assigned to them, that after this transaction we hear no more of them till the time of David. The Gibeonite ambassadors heard Joshua's intimation of their future state with patient submission. They admitted the imposition, and assigned as a reason that, being well aware that Jehovah "had commanded his servant Moses to give the children of Israel all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants of the land from before them," they had done so because they were "sore afraid of their lives."—"Now, behold," they concluded, "we are in thine hand; as it seemeth good and right unto thee to do unto us, do."

The city of Gibeon and its three dependent towns, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim, were preserved, and the inhabitants were acknowledged as domestic tributaries. The alliance formed by them with the Israelites was soon known throughout the country, and exasperated Adoni-zedec, king of Jerusalem, who was in the utmost consternation at the fate of Jericho and Ai, and who "teared greatly, because Gibeon was a great city, as one of the royal cities [not properly a *royal city*, because it had no king, but equal to those cities which had kings], and all the men thereof were mighty." Adoni-zedec, therefore, resolved to punish the Gibeonites for forming this alliance with the invaders, and he entered into treaty with the kings of Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon, all kings of the Amorites, to unite their forces and invest Gibeon. They marched against and encamped before the city. The inhabitants sent to Joshua at Gilgal demanding assistance, being utterly unable to resist those powerful enemies. The Hebrew warrior made a forced march from Gilgal during the night at the head of a chosen body of troops, and came suddenly upon the combined kings, who were panic-struck at this unexpected

attack, and fled in the direction of the mountain on which Beth-horon was afterwards built, in the tribe of Ephraim. They were pursued with great slaughter by the victorious Israelites, but they were overtaken by an extraordinary manifestation of divine judgment, which, while it could not fail to make a deep impression on the minds of the Hebrews, must have excited the most harrowing alarm throughout the country. We are told that "as they fled from before Israel, and were in the going down to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew." Then follows the astonishing event which has excited no little scoffing from some, and which has induced others to argue, on account of its being inserted within paragraphs [¶] in the text, that it is an unwarranted interpolation. "Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man; for the Lord fought for Israel."

The impressive events here recorded ought not to pass unnoticed. Directing our attention first to the "great stones" which Jehovah "cast down from heaven" on the fugitive Amorites of Canaan, some commentators are of opinion that this miracle consisted literally of large stones, and that the term *hailstones* only refers to the manner in which this appalling shower fell. If this has originated from an impression that hailstones were inadequate for the purpose intended, it is certainly a mistake. There are numerous instances on record in the history of various coun-

tries of hailstones of enormous size and weight falling so densely and with such an impetus as to occasion immense damage to property, and to the life of men and cattle. The plague of hail in Egypt may be referred to as another recorded in the sacred writings, respecting which the reader will find sundry observations in their proper place (see *MOSES*). Mezeray, in his *History of France*, mentions hailstones which fell in Italy one hundred pounds in weight; and Dr Halley, in the *Philosophical Transactions*, relates accounts of various storms in which the hailstones weighed from five ounces to one pound, and were from thirteen to fourteen inches in diameter. It cannot be denied that many such accounts may be frequently exaggerated, but it is well known that hailstones have often fallen of great size. In Palestine and the neighbouring countries hailstones are frequent, and the stones are of a size which would be considered extraordinary. These storms chiefly occur in the mountainous districts and along the coast. In the elevated region of Northern Persia the hailstones are so frequent as to destroy the cattle in the fields. With such indisputable facts before us, it would be folly to hesitate in believing the occurrence of a hail-storm such as the one before us, which, being miraculously and opportunely sent, was of far greater power than the operations of nature usually exhibit, to destroy the fugitive Canaanites, who might have otherwise escaped the swords of the Israelites. Moreover, in working miracles, to quote the appropriate language of Stackhouse, "God usually employs natural causes and productions. He does not create any thing new for the purpose, but makes use of what is already created in a new and extraordinary manner. And, therefore, though the shower of hail, and probably the wind too, which made it fall with such impetuosity, were both of them natural, yet, in sending them at this very instant of time, and directing them to fall upon the enemy only, there was manifestly the hand of God, and something supernatural." Joshua, observes

Bishop Hall, fought, but God discomfited the Amorites; the praise is to the workman, not to the instrument. A storm of hail so terrible, so opportune, and so discriminating in its effects, would at once be recognized by the astonished Israelites as a manifestation of that Divine aid which had been all along promised to them, and without which they would have failed in every enterprise.

The other event recorded—that “the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down a whole day”—is one which deserves serious consideration, from the often repeated argument urged against it that the thing is impossible, and therefore absurd. If it could be proved satisfactorily that the verses are interpolated, as some contend from the manner in which they are inserted in the chapter, there would be no necessity for any diversity of opinion; but as this cannot be proved, this argument becomes nugatory and futile. But the Book of Jasher is cited as an authority, and the question is, What was the Book of Jasher? On this subject the opinions of the learned are greatly divided. It literally means the book of *upright* or *righteous persons*, and it is again mentioned only in the Second Book of Samuel (i. 18), on account of a song made by David which he ordered to be recorded in it. Not even a traditional vestige of it has been preserved, and every thing respecting it as a historical document of antiquity rests on mere conjecture. The Jews themselves are divided in their opinions about this book, some thinking it was the Book of Genesis, others that of Deuteronomy; some the Book of Judges, others that of Job; and some, again, the Law generally, in which they suppose the miracle was predicted. It probably was a record of the lives and particular actions of eminent Hebrews, and of the remarkable events which happened in the nation; or it may have been a collection of verses which the Israelites were accustomed to commit to memory, that they might better remember the miracles which God had been pleased to work in their favour.

Dr Hales urges that as Joshua is said to have “gone up from Gilgal all night,” it is probable that the events related took place in the morning. The sun appeared to rise over Gibeon, which lay to the east of the Israelites, and the moon to be about setting over Ajalon, which lay to the west of them, towards the Mediterranean. In this situation, according to the view of this learned writer, Joshua, moved by a divine impulse, uttered this invocation in the sight of Israel, and in consequence the sun “hasted not to go down about a whole day,” namely, in that climate, near the vernal equinox, about thirteen hours, and thus about twenty-six hours of day-light were afforded them for the destruction of the Canaanites, during which they took the city of Makkedah. On the other hand, it is contended that it was towards evening when Joshua called upon the sun and moon, arguing that what is translated *hasted not to go down a whole day*, should be rendered *hasted not to go down when the day was completed*; consequently, that the earth continued its revolution as usual, but that God was pleased at that juncture to give the atmosphere such a refractive power as maintained its image above the horizon long after the sun itself had disappeared. There are other opinions, into the details of which it is unnecessary to enter, all tending to show that the miraculous character of the event may be maintained, and the necessary result effected, without an interference with those laws of motion which regulate the universe.

It is evident that what would popularly be held or described as the standing still of the sun must really be the standing still of the earth, or the suspension of its diurnal revolution. The expression of Joshua was consequently inaccurate, when we connect it with the fact that the alternation of day and night is produced not by the motion of the sun, but by the rotation of the earth on its own axis. But although Joshua's expression was inaccurate, its vindication as a mere form of speech is easy. It is said in popular

language among ourselves every day that the *sun rises and sets*, and the idea is conveyed, and is probably believed by many who know no better, that the earth is stationary, and that the sun revolves or traverses the firmament. This is the language of even the most correct writers and speakers, implying motion in the sun itself, and perhaps it cannot be avoided without considerable circumlocution and restraint of phraseology. And if this is the case at the present time, when the solar system is well ascertained, and the rotatory motion of the earth satisfactorily demonstrated, we may easily understand what it must have been in the time of Joshua when the doctrine of the universe was unknown, and when the correct description of the phenomenon would have been not only altogether unintelligible, but would have involved explanations and discussions quite distinct from the object which Joshua had in view, or for which the Scriptures were written; for it must be apparent to every reader of the inspired writings that things are often not expressed according to the strict rules of philosophy—nor is it necessary they should be so expressed—but according to their appearances and the common notions regarding them. The great object in this case of the sun standing still was that the people should understand what was intended, and that God should receive the glory. It is a matter of little consequence to inquire whether Joshua was acquainted with the solar system; it was not necessary that he should have been so; and the probability is, that he as an individual was not. All that he wanted was the prolongation of the day for a specific purpose, and he believed that God was able and willing to grant his request. The point is certain, therefore, that the day *was* miraculously prolonged, “until the people had avenged themselves on their enemies;” beyond this we know nothing; it is quite impossible to account for it on philosophical principles; we are not required to know more than the literal fact as it is recorded; and every consideration must be resolved into an

extraordinary manifestation of the Divine Power. Bishop Tomline happily observes, that as the sun and moon were the ordinary deities of the heathen world, this signal miracle seems to have been directed against the prevailing worship of the host of heaven, and that nothing could be more strikingly calculated to correct this idolatry than to behold “the sun and moon stand still” at the command of the general of the armies of the God of Israel. In the opinion of Stackhouse, it can never be affirmed that the miracle is impossible or incredible, since it is certain and self-evident that the great Author of nature, who gave being and motion to the sun and stars, may stop that motion when and as long as He pleases, especially when their rest will contribute to His glory; for every thing which is contrary to the ordinary course of nature requires the interposition of an almighty power, and whatever is not impossible in itself is equally possible with God. “If God had dictated to Joshua,” says Shuckford, “to record the miracle in terms suited to the modern discoveries in astronomy, Joshua would have appeared to express it in a manner directly contrary to all rules of science then known, and his account of what had happened would have been objected to as false in astronomy. It would have appeared rather a wild fancy, or a gross blunder of his own than a true account of a real miracle, and so would have been received with little attention by the persons for whom it was written. Thus, when God directed Joshua to record this miracle, He did not direct him to record it in a manner more suitable to true astronomy, because if He had done so, unless He inspired the world at the same time with a true knowledge of astronomy, the account would have rather tended to raise among those who read and heard of it *disputes and oppositions of science falsely so called*, than have promoted the great ends of religion intended by it.”—“I think it idle, if not impious,” says Bishop Watson, “to undertake to explain how the miracle was performed.

but one who is not able to explain the mode of doing a thing argues ill if he thence infers that the miracle was not done. The machine of the universe is in the hand of God: He can stop the motion of any part, or of the whole, with less trouble and less danger of injuring it than any of us can stop a watch."

We must now return from this digression, which, considering the nature of the subject, is almost unavoidable, to Joshua. After the remarkable defeat of the five kings, and the impressive events which distinguished it, the Hebrew general was about to return to his camp at Gilgal, when he was informed that the five kings were concealed in a cave at **Makkedah**. Joshua ordered the cave to be secured and vigilantly guarded, while he sent detachments in pursuit of several of the enemy still remaining. When the troops returned without meeting any to attack them, and "none moved his tongue against any of the children of Israel," he ordered the kings to be brought out, and desired the "captains of the men of war" to put their feet upon the necks of the defeated princes. This was anciently a common form of expressing a triumph over a fallen adversary, which was not peculiar to the East. They were afterwards ignominiously put to death, their bodies were thrown into the cave in which they had concealed themselves, and large stones were placed at its entrance which long remained as a memorial of the event.

Several kings were defeated in successive attacks by Joshua, and their capital cities taken and destroyed. The Hebrews were every where victorious, and almost all the south of the Promised Land was subjugated. By this time the northern kings, headed by Jabin, king of Hazor, collected an army provided with chariots and cavalry at the "waters of Merom," thought to be the lake near the head of the Jordan lying in the midst of a wide and solitary plain, afterwards called *Semochonitis*, and now *Bahr el-Houle*. It is necessary, however, to state—and there are certainly some

circumstances which seem to favour this conclusion, that the "waters of Merom," at which those northern kings of the Canaanites congregated their forces, cannot mean the lake Houle, through which the Jordan flows, but probably the river Kishon in the Plain of Esdraelon, which falls into the Mediterranean in the Bay of Acre at the foot of Mount Carmel, because, as the lake Houle must have been fifteen or twenty leagues within the territory of the confederates, it was more likely they would meet Joshua on their frontiers than allow him to penetrate so far into their country before giving him battle. Joshua fell upon them unexpectedly, and gained such a decisive victory, that it in effect brought all the northern parts of Canaan under his dominion. The kings were slain, and their cities were despoiled, but only Hazor, the capital of the chief of those little principalities, was destroyed by fire. The race called the *Anakim* were almost extirpated, only a few finding refuge in Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod. Nevertheless, there still remained scattered cities and large tracts of country in the possession of the Canaanites, with whom a desultory war was carried on for some time, but after the land was divided it was left to each tribe to expel its own enemies. It must be observed, moreover, that some towns which Joshua took were retaken by the former inhabitants, and others which he destroyed were rebuilt.

We are told that "now Joshua was old and stricken in years, and the Lord said unto him, Thou art old and stricken in years, and there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed." He was then ordered to divide "this land for an inheritance unto the nine tribes, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, with whom the Reubenites and the Gadites have received their inheritance which Moses gave them beyond Jordan eastward." To what age Joshua was now advanced we do not know with certainty, because we do not know his age when he came out of Egypt. He was one hundred and ten years old when he died, and as the Jews affirm

that the survey and division of the country occupied seven years, he was probably about a hundred years of age, as he does not appear to have lived long after that transaction. Since from his declining years Joshua could not hope to conquer the "land which yet remained," he was commanded to begin the business of dividing the territory among the tribes. It is unnecessary to enter into geographical details respecting the situation of the several tribes, and the boundaries of their different allotments, which will be understood by consulting the best constructed maps of the Promised Land. The tribe of Levi had no cantonment, because "the sacrifices of the Lord God of Israel made by fire were their inheritance;" but they received forty-eight cities, six of which were assigned as cities of refuge, as Moses had prescribed. The promise made by Jehovah having been conditional, and depending on the adherence of the Israelites to his worship and service, we find that, in consequence of their flagrant and repeated disobedience, they only partially received, as they only partially deserved, the fulfilment of that promise. Thus, we do not read that the Sidonians were ever conquered, and the tribes inhabiting Lebanon were not made tributary till the time of David and Solomon. The Jebusites were not conquered till the time of the former king, and the tribe of Ephraim did not drive out the Canaanites, but allowed them to remain on the terms of paying tribute. The tribe of Manasseh acted in a similar manner. In the case of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, Joshua gave a striking instance of his impartiality. They complained to him of the narrowness of their allotment, which was increased by the Canaanites still retaining a large portion of it; but Joshua, though himself a descendant of Joseph, would show them no particular favour, and told them that they must enlarge the country by their valour, by driving out their enemies from the woody and mountainous parts, and thus making these habitable. He consented

to add the mountain of Ephraim to their cantonment, but as it respected any other enlargement it was impossible, as it had been all settled by a divine decree. An inheritance was assigned to Joshua in his own tribe of Ephraim. The Israelites "gave him the city which he asked, even Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim; and he built the city, and dwelt there." It thus appears, although it is not expressed elsewhere, that Jehovah granted to Joshua a peculiar privilege of choosing his own portion, as he had done to Caleb.

The forty thousand men of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, located beyond the Jordan, now returned to their own allotments, and erected a monument on the banks of the river, as a memorial of their connection with the nine tribes and a half on the other side. This design was misunderstood, and was almost the occasion of a civil war. Joshua now prepared himself for death in a manner which finely represents his pious magnanimity. To prevent degeneracy he convened two public assemblies, and earnestly exhorted the rulers to be faithful to Jehovah, and conscientiously to observe his law. He caused a new election to be made of God for their King, which was solemnly acknowledged by the people, and he erected a permanent monument of their renewal of their homage, at the same time recording the whole transactions in the Book of the Law. He soon afterwards died, and was buried in Timnath-serah, on the north side of the hill of Gaash, seventeen years after the entrance into Canaan, and, according to the Hebrew chronology, about B.C. 1426.

Joshua, says Professor Jahn, was "a man who devoted his whole life to the settlement of the theocratic policy, and consequently to the preservation of the true religion—services which ought to endear his memory to all succeeding ages." Josephus, in concisely commenting on his character, says that he was a man of political prudence, and endued also with singular felicity of popular eloquence in expressing his thoughts—

brave and indefatigable in war, and no less just and dexterous in peace—in short, that he was a person qualified for all great purposes. The author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus has an eloquent eulogium on this great hero of the Hebrew nation:—"Jesus, the son of Nave [the substitution of *Nave* for *Nun* seems to have been an ancient error of the Greek copyists], was valiant in the wars, and was the successor of Moses in prophecies, who, according to his name, was made great for the saving of the elect of God, and taking vengeance of the enemies that rose up against them, that he might set Israel in their inheritance. How great glory gat he, when he did lift up his hands, and stretched out his sword against the cities! Who before him so stood to it? for the Lord himself brought his enemies unto him. Did not the sun go back by his means? and was not one day as long as two? He called upon the most high Lord, when the enemies pressed him upon every side, and the great Lord heard him. And with bailstones of mighty power he made the battle to fall violently upon the nations, and in the descent [of Beth-horon] he destroyed them that resisted, that the nations might know all their strength, because he fought in the sight of the Lord, and he followed the Mighty One."

JOSIAH, the son and successor of Amon, king of Judah, was raised to the throne at the assassination of his father, when he was only eight years old. This is the prince of whom it was intimated to Jeroboam three hundred and sixty years before he was born—"O altar, altar, thus saith the Lord, Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name, and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee." When Josiah succeeded to the crown of Judah, superstition and wickedness, encouraged by his father's profligate example, very generally prevailed, and while he continued a minor, and the affairs of the government were administered by a guardian,

idolatry was tolerated, if not protected; but the young king, who had manifested pious and virtuous principles, assumed the administration himself in the sixteenth year of his age, and began to adopt measures for the restoration of the worship of the true God. He destroyed idolatry, removed the illegal altars of Jehovah, and in the twenty-sixth year of his age the regular service of the Temple was re-established. Whilst Josiah was engaged in this pious work, and repairing the Temple, which had sunk into a state of dilapidation, the Book of the Law by Moses was found—probably a copy of the Pentateuch deposited in the Temple for security by some pious priest in a former reign. It was read to the king, who in consequence promoted reformation with still greater zeal, ordered the festivals to be rigidly observed, and endeavoured to render idolatry an object of universal disgust and abhorrence. With this view he assembled the elders of the people in the Temple, and there entered into a solemn covenant to observe the statutes and ordinances enjoined by the Law. The elders testified their assent to this covenant; the ark was restored to its proper place; the Temple was purified; the idolatrous utensils were removed, and supplanted by those consecrated to the worship of God. The Passover was then celebrated with such splendour that it is said of it—"Surely there was not holden such a passover from the days of the judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah, but in the eighteenth year of king Josiah, wherein this passover was holden to the Lord in Jerusalem." Josiah extended his efforts for the utter extirpation of idolatry to the cantonnments of the tribes of Simeon, Ephraim, and Manassch, and even to the distant tribe of Naphtali, and he literally fulfilled the prophecy recorded of him three hundred and sixty years before he was born, by burning dead men's bones at Bethel, and destroying the altar and the high place there; but in pursuing his plans of reformation he

was resisted by the inveterate habits of the people, and his zealous and persevering efforts were to a great extent ineffectual. The hearts of the Jews were not firmly engaged in it, and the whole was a mere compliance with the resolutions of their sovereign, for, as the event fully proves, they were ready to relapse into their old idolatry and vice at the first opportunity. Their degeneracy was so invincible, that Jehovah was provoked to inflict upon them those calamities which were denounced by the Prophet Zephaniah. In the thirty-first year of Josiah's reign, Pharaoh-Necho advanced with a great army towards the Euphrates to make war on the Medes and Babylonians under Nabopolassar, who had recently destroyed Nineveh, and overthrown the Assyrian Empire. He landed at Acco, otherwise Ptolemais, or Acre, with his army, to march through Palestine to the Chaldeæ-Babylonian dominions, but Josiah, who appears to have been at that time in alliance with Nabopolassar, would not allow him a passage through his dominions. Necho accordingly drew up his army in the Plain of Esdrælon, and a battle was fought at Megiddo in the tribe of Manasseh, in which the king of Egypt was victorious, and Josiah, who went disguised into the field, was mortally wounded. He was brought to Jerusalem, and interred in his own sepulchre, B.C. 610. This is the battle mentioned by Herodotus, in his notice of which he speaks of the Hebrews as Syrians, of the town of Megiddo as Magdolon, and of Jerusalem as Kadytis, or *the holy*. Josiah was greatly lamented by his subjects, and an elegy was written on the occasion of his death by the Prophet Jeremiah, which is now lost. With him perished all the prosperity, honour, and glory of the Jewish nation, for nothing afterwards ensued but a melancholy series of divine judgments on the land, till at length the kingdom of Judah was overthrown and Jerusalem destroyed. "It has been thought by some," observes Dr Prideaux, "that Josiah engaged rashly and unadvisedly in this enterprise, from an exces-

sive confidence in himself, but this is a supposition unworthy of so religious a prince. It is more probable that the kings of Judah had from the time of Manassæ's restoration bound themselves by oath to adhere to the kings of Babylon against all their enemies, and in recompence for this they seem to have had conferred upon them by the Assyrians all the land of Canaan which had been possessed by the Ten Tribes. It seems certain that Josiah possessed the whole land of Israel, as David and Solomon possessed it, before the separation of the Ten Tribes, for his reformation extended through every part of it, and seems to have been every where conducted with the same authority. Allowing then this compact to have subsisted between Josiah and the king of Babylon, he would have been guilty of a breach of fidelity if he had not endeavoured to stop the progress of the king of Egypt." Bishop Sherlock, however, offers the following commentary on these observations:—"It may be doubted whether King Josiah was not guilty of a want of trust in God in his warlike preparations against the king of Egypt. Josiah has so good a character in Scripture that both Jews and Christians have been at a loss to account for the unfortunate end he came to, being slain in battle against the king of Egypt. The learned Dr Prideaux has justified his conduct in opposing the passage of the king of Egypt, because it was a service due to the king of Assyria, to whom Josiah was a vassal. Be it so, yet his duty to the king of Assyria could not dissolve his dependence on a higher Master; he went to war as vassal of the king of Assyria, but did he ask counsel of God as king of Judah? or was he attended to the war with such forces only as the king of Judah might lawfully use? That he had chariots and horsemen appears plainly from the account of his death, for he was wounded in one chariot and removed into another to be carried off, and it is very probable that there were many chariots and horsemen in his army. Thus, I see that he was found in the day of battle, not with the

equipage of a king of Judah, but surrounded with forces to which the law of God had forbidden him to trust, and which had often proved a strength fatal to his ancestors."

JUDAH, the fourth son of Jacob and Leah, was born in Mesopotamia, B.C. 1755. He was always regarded as the chief of Jacob's children, and he certainly, next to Joseph, was the most eminent of them. The privileges of the first-born were transferred to him, after the crime committed by Reuben. He was the ancestor of the royal tribe, from whom the Messiah was descended. Judah acted a prominent part in the transactions of his brethren with Joseph during the famine in Egypt. See JOSEPH.

JUDAS ISCARIOT. Various meanings are given to the surname of the traitor, *the man of Kerioth*, or *of the bag*, or one that *cuts off*, or *takes a bribe*. All these may apply to him, but for what, or by whom, the cognomen was given, we have no information. His name stands recorded for ever as the most infamous of traitors, but what parents had the misfortune of bringing him into the world, and what town or village among the thousands of Judah or Galilee had the disgrace of his early life, we are left in ignorance. We have evidence enough that he was one of those who followed Christ from the commencement of his ministry, and we may safely conclude that he believed him (in some sense of his own) to be the promised Messiah and victorious deliverer of the Jews. But the subject becomes more awful and mysterious when we contemplate Him, who knew the hearts of all men, and who saw from the first that this was he who was to betray him, choosing him as one of the most favoured of his associates, unfolding to him all his heart and motives and designs, admitting him as a witness of his most secret actions, and sending him forth along with the rest, endued with full commission to proclaim his approach, and the coming of his kingdom, and to confirm the truth of what he proclaimed by working miracles. All

this is plain from the record of the Evangelists, and for years of the history of Christ's preaching no intimation is given that the future traitor entertained hopes, or harboured designs, less innocent or sincere than the other eleven Apostles.

We learn from that infallible record that avarice, "the love of money"—"the root of all evil"—was his ruling passion. Mammon was the idol which he worshipped—

Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell
From heaven; for even in heaven his looks and
thoughts
Were always downward bent, admiring more
The riches of heaven's pavement, trodden gold,
Than aught divine or holy else enjoyed
In vision beatific.

There is no question but he expected that one who, he saw, possessed the command of all the elements of nature, and who had power which he believed irresistible, would succeed in his undertaking. With the rest of the Jews he thought that that one was to sit on the throne of David, and to become universal monarch of the world. In their various journeys, Christ and his disciples had one common stock of money, supplied chiefly from charitable contributions. From a remark of Judas we learn that this was appropriated occasionally to the supply of the poor, as well as of their own wants. Judas, probably at his own request, was made keeper of the bag. That it was not very amply stored in general, we may learn from the fact that when the publican demanded the usual tribute-money of Peter and his Master at Capernaum, a miracle was wrought to meet the claim. Frugal and narrow, however, as was the treasure of Him who created and was Lord of all, his avaricious treasurer contrived to appropriate part to himself—we are informed that he was a thief.

Our Saviour knew his practices, and saw to what they were inevitably tending, and it was not without repeated warnings that this evil spirit was allowed to take despotic possession of his covetous heart. Early in his public ministry Christ had foretold that one of the twelve should betray him. Had he told Judas

to his face that he was the man, probably he would have exclaimed, with the Syrian captain Hazeel, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" It was by degrees only that he was prepared for this act of base treachery. We are not told who he was that was grieved and was offended when the *rich* young ruler was deterred from becoming a disciple, by being requested, as a test of his sincerity, to sell all that he possessed and give to the poor, and follow Christ, but we may be certain that the demand was astounding to the covetous treasurer. Christ was thrice anointed with costly ointment. We are not informed that Judas ventured the first time to object to what we know he looked upon as extravagant and useless expenditure; but the second instance of the same affectionate compliment, in the house of Lazarus, was too much for him to endure longer. He complained loudly of the waste, asking why the costly perfume was not "sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor," covering his own mercenary selfishness under a pretence of charity for others. The third instance of the same kind completely outraged him, and he went direct from the house of Simon into the city to take his own means of putting an end to such extravagant profusion as he considered it. It will be observed that all this time the real character of the traitorous keeper of the treasure was not observed by the rest of the Apostles. Christ asked, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" but it is far from probable that their suspicion rested on the apparently cautious and charitable but hypocritical Judas. Even to the very last, after he had gone to bargain with the priests and rulers to betray Jesus for a sum of money, they had no suspicions. Thrice, with the utmost solemnity and sorrow, at the Last Supper, did he declare to the conscious Judas that the traitor sat with him at table, adding the terrible declaration that it "would have been better for that man had he never been born." All the rest, one after another, aware of the per-

fect knowledge which their Master possessed of their hearts, put the question, "Is it I?" Judas also asked the same question, apparently in a whisper, and received a reply which sufficiently intimated to him that Jesus thoroughly knew what he had done, and still designed to do. He still sat without misgiving of heart or change of purpose, partaking with the others of that most sacred pledge of deepest love and closest union, which symbolized that body soon to be broken—that blood soon to be shed by his guilty means. It was not till he had been once more pointed out expressly to the beloved disciple, by Jesus giving him a sop out of his own hand, that he rose to execute his purpose. "What thou doest," said Jesus, "do quickly;" and the majority of the Apostles were still ignorant that from that moment the traitor's portion was cut off from them for ever. They thought that he had gone to purchase what was necessary for the remaining day of the feast, or to give something to the poor.

We need not seek any other motive for the conduct of the unhappy Judas than the obvious one, which was the ruling passion of his whole character—the basest avarice. The small bribe of thirty pieces of silver, a sum not above three or four pounds of our money, was not indeed sufficient to satisfy that passion, or render the solution free of objections. His subsequent conduct, when he learned that Jesus was indeed apprehended, tried, and condemned, shows that he had not anticipated such a result. The more worldly-minded and doubting of the friends of Jesus had before urged him to advance his claims openly before the rulers and priests of Jerusalem, and Judas might think, in the wickedness of his covetous and ambitious heart, that if his Master were compelled to assert his authority and power, he would defeat all opposition, as he had hitherto always done, and establish by force that sovereignty of temporal grandeur on which alone his heart was set. It seems probable that the devil, who took possession of him, led him to the commission

of the act of treachery by such impious reasoning as this; but this supposition does not in any degree diminish or palliate the traitor's guilt. He knew that Christ was no deceiver, and never pretended to believe it. Had the priests and rulers been able to persuade him to come forward with such evidence, they would have eagerly seized upon it as the most triumphant justification of their conduct. Yet knowing all this, and being repeatedly warned of his guilt, and the terrible condemnation awaiting him for the perpetration of his diabolical purpose, he went warned, and in the face of heaven, to commit his crime. He bartered eternal happiness for the price of the meanest slave.

When he saw the certain and fatal result of his scheme of accursed avarice, the horrors of remorse and despair seized him. He returned to the priests and elders, and confessed that he had betrayed innocent blood. Such a solemn declaration, extorted by the unsufferable agony of guilt, had no effect upon those blinded and callous murderers. They now mocked him, tauntingly telling him that it was no business of theirs; they had gained their object, and cared not for the anguish of his tormenting conscience. But Satan, who had now made sure of his victim, drove him to another deed of guilty desperation. That terrible remorse, instead of awakening the better feelings of his heart, and urging him to rush through the crowd and the soldiers, to fall at his Master's feet, to supplicate his pardon, and proclaim his innocence aloud before all, drove him into the presence of his heavenly Judge with an additional load of guilt upon his head. He rushed into eternity as a self-murderer, without one petition for mercy before his betrayed and rejected Master expired.

Several commentators suppose that the intolerable agony of his remorse choked him, and that in the extremity of his grief he fell on his face and burst asunder. The word used by Matthew will certainly bear such a sense, though it is unusual,

and the more particular account given by Peter in the first chapter of the Acts is by no means inconsistent with such an interpretation. But it is preferable to adhere to the interpretation of our translators, that the traitor hanged himself, which St Matthew simply mentions, and that the additional particulars related by Peter, in the first chapter of the Acts, happened when he was cut down and fell from some height—"he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out"—a miserable spectacle of speedy vengeance to all who witnessed it. We might be apt to suppose that the Fathers Theophanes and Theophylact were uttering a jest when they gravely state that Judas, knowing that Jesus was to descend to Hades to bring back the souls in prison, determined to arrive thither before him, there to supplicate his pardon, and be rescued along with the rest. There is not the slightest reason to believe that his remorse was that godly sorrow which worketh true repentance. As Whitby observes, we may be more astonished at the hardened guilt and obstinacy of the priests and elders, who thought his crime and the confession of it nothing to them. The traitor was an instrument in their hands, but when he acknowledged his wickedness, and threw down their money, though he did not palliate his own sin, he brought the full weight of it upon the heads of those who violently demanded that our Saviour should be crucified. That guilt has ever since been heavy upon the heads of their unbelieving descendants, and there it will lie till they acknowledge that Messiah whom their fathers crucified, and wash out with the tears of genuine repentance the deep dye of that Aceldama, purchased by the blood of their promised King shed on Calvary.

JUDE, or JUDAS, the brother of James the Less, called also Thaddeus, and Lebbeus, in the notices of the Apostles given in the New Testament. It is of no importance to inquire into the reason of this variety of names by which he is known—a practice common among the Jews. It might be to distinguish him

from the traitor, or, as Cave supposes, to avoid mentioning part of the incommunicable name of Jehovah, which in that age was never pronounced by any one except the high priest on the day of the great atonement, when he entered into the holiest place. We are not informed of the time or circumstances when he first followed Christ as a disciple, no mention being made of him till we find him appointed an Apostle. Neither is there any particular notice of him afterwards, till we find him putting a particular question to Christ at the Last Supper, "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" His mind was probably then filled with those expectations of worldly glory and power which were so strongly fixed in the belief of the others. He remained with the one hundred and twenty disciples till after the gift of the Holy Ghost, but all the ancient accounts agree that he soon after left Jerusalem to preach the gospel. We may safely conclude, however, that he did not go beyond the boundaries of Judea, or at least that he did not preach to the Gentiles, till after the conversion of Cornelius. We learn from Nicephorus that he visited Arabia and the neighbouring countries, and afterwards Syria and Mesopotamia, and came at last to Edessa to King Abgarus, where he confirmed the converts made by another Thaddeus, of whose success Eusebius gives a particular account, translated from the Syriac, and taken from the records of that city. He is also said by Paulinus to have preached the gospel in Libya, but we have no authentic particulars of his life, or even of his death. One of the above historians mentions that he died peaceably and highly honoured at Edessa; others say that he suffered martyrdom at Berytus. The writers of the Roman Church maintain that he travelled into Persia, and preached the truth with great success, till he at last incurred the resentment of the Magi for his condemnation of their superstitious rites, who combined against him, and got him cruelly shot to death with arrows.

It is plain that all these accounts cannot be true, and perhaps the whole of them are more or less fabulous. From the character of the Epistle which he has left, and the allusions in it to some of the later of those of St Peter and St Paul, and to the perversions of the truth and corruption of manners which he strongly condemns to the Christian converts, we may conclude that he lived till after the death of those two Apostles, or probably till after the destruction of Jerusalem. That he was one of the married Apostles we infer from an anecdote reported from an earlier historian by Eusebius. Domitian, who must have heard of the Jewish prophecies from his father Vespasian and his brother Titus, regarding the great Deliverer of the Jews and Conqueror of the world, learned that there were still descendants of King David and near relations of Jesus remaining. Two young men were brought to the jealous tyrant, who wished, like Herod, to cut off every one who might have any pretence to his power. They confessed that they were grandsons of this Jude, and near relatives of Jesus, and that they supported themselves by cultivating a small paternal property by their own industry. Their appearance and the hard skin of their hands confirmed the truth of their story, and calmed the jealousy of Domitian. He is said to have asked them what was to be the character of Christ's kingdom, and when it was to commence? They replied, as Jesus did to Pilate, that it was heavenly, and not of this earth, and would commence at the termination of the world. The master of seventy legions had no dread of such pretenders or of such a sovereignty, and dismissed them with contempt. We may also conclude from this anecdote that St Jude was then dead, otherwise the imperial jealousy would have been first directed against him. From this story the apocryphal author of the apparently spurious Apostolical Constitutions has inserted the following—"Some of us are fishermen, others tent-makers, others husbandmen."

"By the latter part of the sentence," says Lardner, "no more may be meant than that there was among them one tent-maker, St Paul, and one husbandman, intending perhaps St Jude." He probably survived all his older brothers, and succeeded as the representative of the royal line of David to the small remaining property of that family.

It was a considerable time before the Epistle of Jude was added into the Scripture canon, and objections have been stated to its inspiration, because the writer does not style himself an Apostle, and alludes to apocryphal books and incidents not mentioned in the Old Testament. As to the first he is not singular, many of the Apostolic writers calling themselves simply "servants of Jesus Christ;" and as to the latter, most of the Apostles and Evangelists quote facts, sayings, and prophecies, not recorded in the sacred writings of the Old Testament which have come down to us. By the great majority of the Fathers of the Church this Epistle is held to be canonical, and is characterized by Origen as "powerful in expression, and full of heavenly dignity and grace."

JUDITH, a distinguished Jewess, said to have been of the tribe of Reuben, was the daughter of Merari and the widow of Manasseh. Nebuchodonozor, king of the Assyrians, having defeated Arphaxad, king of the Medes, and taken him prisoner, sent Holofernes with a powerful army to extend his conquests. This general took possession of Idumea, and the Israelites in alarm retired to the hilly country and fortified their cities, where their exertions were encouraged by the high priest Joachim or Eliakim, who exhorted them to confide in God, and to implore his success. Holofernes, surprised at their vigorous preparations to resist his well disciplined and victorious army, inquired at the Moabites and Ammonites what force they could command, and the reason of their refusing to submit to him. Achior, the chief of the latter, informed him that the Jews were a people who were sometimes protected

and at other times forsaken by their God—that if they had offended their God they would certainly fall into the hands of Holofernes, but if not, their God would defend them, and his whole army would not be able to conquer them. This account was received with the utmost indignation and contempt by Holofernes, who ordered Achior to be carried to Bethulia, which he immediately besieged, intending to revenge himself on Achior as soon as he had taken the place.

Onias, the governor of Bethulia, prepared to defend the town, but the inhabitants dreaded the event of a long siege, and wished to surrender. They could scarcely be induced to continue their resistance five days. At this crisis Judith, a rich and beautiful widow, resolved to proceed to the camp of Holofernes, and endeavour to destroy him. We are told that "when Judith was come before him and his servants, they all marvelled at the beauty of her countenance, and she fell down upon her face, and did reverence unto him, and his servants took her up." Holofernes, who believed Judith's pretended tale, was soon captivated, and entertained her at a sumptuous feast, when in the joy of his heart, in expectation of obtaining a triumph over this fascinating Jewess, he indulged in drinking wine to excess, and soon fell into a profound sleep. Bagoas, his eunuch, who had introduced Judith and her female servant to the feast, had by this time shut all the chamber doors and departed. Thus left alone with Holofernes, Judith availed herself of the opportunity, cut off his head with his own "fauchion" or sabre, put it into her servant's bag, which had been brought for the purpose, though a different reason was assigned for appearing with such a commodity, and they "twain went together according to their custom unto prayer, and when they had passed the camp they compassed the valley, and went up the mountain to Bethulia, and came to the gates thereof." It ought to have been noticed, that Judith had previously obtained leave from Holofernes to visit and leave the camp at

pleasure, which accounts for the facility with which she reached Bethulia unsuspected by the Assyrians, who never imagined for a moment that she was capable of murdering their general. When the head of Holofernes was displayed to view on the walls of Bethulia the Assyrians were seized with dismay, and fled in great disorder pursued by the Israelites, who killed many of them, and obtained large spoils. Judith sang a hymn of praise to God, to whom she also consecrated the arms of Holofernes, and accompanied the people to Jerusalem, to present their public thanksgiving for this signal deliverance. It is said she afterwards returned to Bethulia, where she lived to the advanced age of one hundred and five years, and was buried with her husband in that city. The people mourned for her seven days, and the day on which the Assyrians were defeated was reckoned among their festivals by the Jews.

Such is an outline of the story of Judith as given in the Apocryphal Book which bears her name, and though it represents her as a woman of great courage, it no where intimates that she was without faults. Stackhouse justly observes that "the manner of her preparation for her enterprise, and the success which attended it, may make us presume that the design was originally from God, but then the continued train of falsehood and dissimulation, with which it was carried on, must needs persuade us that the means of conducting it were left to the woman, who has given on this occasion a remarkable specimen of sagacity and artifice." The canonical and authentic authority of the Book of Judith has been greatly disputed. It is cited by several of the Ecclesiastical Fathers, and we are informed by Jerome in his Preface to his version of it that it was received among the canonical Books by the Council of Nice. The African Church acknowledged it, and it was confirmed by the Council of Trent. On the other hand, it is rejected as canonical on the most conclusive evidence by the Protestant Church, and many are of the opinion of Grotius,

though they do not adopt his opinions to the full extent, that the whole is a parabolical fiction written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, when he marched into Judea, and raised a cruel persecution against the Jews. This opinion is thus noticed by Dr Prideaux, who fixes the events recorded in the time of Manasseh, after examining all the objections relative to the Book and its history. "If any one will contend that it is only a religious romance, and not a true history—that, according to the intention of the author, the scene of it was under the reign of Xerxes, when Joachim, the son of Joshua, was high priest, and the civil government of Judea, as well as the ecclesiastical, was in the hands of that officer—and that the inconsistency of so many particulars in that Book with the state and transactions of those times was only from the ignorance of the author of the history of the said times, and his unskilfulness in placing the scene of his history in them—I say, if any will insist on all this, I shall not enter into any controversy with him, only thus much I must insist on, that if it be a true history, which I am inclined most to think, though I will not be positive, it can fall no where else but in the time where I have placed it."

The greatest difficulty in the Book of Judith is to fix the time when the events recorded in it happened, but as this is simply a dry and unsatisfactory detail of chronological conjectures it is unnecessary to follow them in this place. The author is also uncertain, nor is it known in what language it was originally written. The Hebrew copy which some professed to have seen at Constantinople was probably a modern composition, and our English translation is, like the Syriac, made from a Greek version which is supposed to have been known to Clement of Rome, by whom it is cited in his Epistle to the Corinthians, and it is also noticed in the ancient work called the Apostolical Constitutions.

JUSTUS, a name of St Matthias the Apostle. See MATTHIAS.

JUSTUS, a Christian of Corinth, with whom St Paul resided—"one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue." He is mentioned by the Apostle in his Epistle to the

Colossians as also called **Jesus**, among those of the "circumcision," who were his "fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God," and who had been a "comfort" unto him, Col. iv. 11.

K

KEDAR, a son of Ishmael so called, Gen. xxv. 13, one of the "twelve princes according to their nations," and an ancestor of the Arabs. See **ISHMAEL**. Arabia Deserta is sometimes called Kedar in Scripture, but the descendants of Kedar dwelt chiefly in the south of that region.

KETURAH, a wife of the Patriarch Abraham after the death of Sarah, by whom he had six sons, who became the ancestors of many different nations. The Jews allege that Keturah is the same as Hagar, and that she was recalled by Abraham after Sarah's death, but this is a mere fancy for which there is no authority. Others think that Keturah was a Canaanite. Although she is called the Patriarch's *wife*, she was simply a secondary one, according to the custom of those early times, and in another place she is called his concubine, 1 Chron. i. 32. Some think that Keturah became the Patriarch's secondary wife during the life of Sarah, and had borne him children long before her death, after which event she was raised to the rank of matron in his household. This conjecture is sanctioned by the existing usages of the East, and by taking into account the great age of Abraham when Sarah died, yet his sons by Keturah were old enough to be sent away to form independent tribes before his own death. See **ABRAHAM**.

KISH, of the tribe of Benjamin, was the father of Saul. Other persons of this name are mentioned in various parts of the Scripture.

KOHATH, one of the sons of Levi, and the ancestor of a great branch of the

Levites called the Kohathites, whose particular duty, "from thirty years old and upwards, even until fifty years old, all that enter into the host, to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation," was to carry the ark and the most holy things, which were always borne on their shoulders. The services they rendered are minutely described, Numb. iv. 5-15. Kohath died in the hundred and thirty-third year of his age, Exod. vi. 18. His sons were Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel. The first was the father of Moses and Aaron.

KORAH, the son of Izhar, and grandson of Kohath, was involved in the celebrated conspiracy with Dathan and Abiram against Moses and Aaron, and they were all destroyed in the remarkable manner recorded by Moses. This affair seems to have originated in the jealousy with which Korah, himself of the tribe of Levi, and a near relative of Moses and Aaron, regarded the appointment of the family of the latter to the hereditary priesthood, while the Levites were simply their servants. The other principal persons mentioned by name were Reubenites. The Jewish writers describe Korah as a man of great wealth and influence. When the conspirators were overtaken by their signal punishment, we are informed that "the children of Korah died not" in the destruction which cut off the entire families of Dathan and Abiram. The Mahometans relate several traditions of Korah, whom they designate *Karam*, and allege that he was the son of Maasab, cousin of Moses. See **AARON** and **MOSES**.

LABAN. See **JACOB.**

LAMECH, the fifth in descent from Cain, is introduced to our notice as marrying two wives, Adah and Zillah, and from this circumstance being so minutely recorded, it is probable that it is the first instance of polygamy—a practice which has ever since prevailed in the countries where it originated. It certainly did not commence in the family of Seth. There are only four of Lamech's children mentioned in Scripture, but Josephus gravely assures us that he had seventy-seven by his two wives. His discourse to his wives has caused considerable discussion among commentators, and there are those who contend that Lamech asserts that he killed Cain, according to an ancient Oriental tradition respecting the fate of the first fratricide. Shuckford understands the discourse as an interrogation, and thus paraphrases it as addressed by Lamech to his wives—after noticing that the descendants of Cain lived a long time in fear of the family of Adam, lest they should attempt to revenge the murder of Abel—"Why should we make our lives uneasy with these groundless suspicions? We have not killed a man, nor offered any injury to our brethren of the other family, and surely reason must teach them that they can have no right to hurt us. Cain, indeed, our ancestor, killed Abel, but God was pleased so far to forgive his sin as to threaten to take seven-fold vengeance on any one that should kill him. If so, surely they must expect a much greater punishment who shall presume to kill any of us. If Cain shall be avenged seven-fold, surely Lamech or any of his innocent family seventy-seven-fold." Suidas pretends that Lamech killed two brothers of Enoch, and married their wives.

LAMECH, the son of Methuselah, and father of Noah, was the eighth antedilu-

vian Patriarch in descent from Adam, and lived seven hundred and seventy-seven years.

LAZARUS, the brother of Martha and Mary, and specially honoured, like his excellent sisters, with the friendship of our blessed Saviour, was an inhabitant of Bethany. The narrative of our Saviour raising him from the dead after he had been interred in the sepulchral cave four days is so admirably and minutely narrated by St John (xi. 1-44), that it is only necessary here to refer the reader to that great, impressive, and illustrious transaction, which was not done in secret, but in the presence of many of the Jews, as well as of the relatives of the deceased, and triumphantly proved that He was most truly the Son of God with power, the Second Person of the glorious Trinity, to whom his Father had committed all power in heaven and in earth. "Lazarus," exclaimed the Divine Saviour of the world, "come forth: And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin." But who could resist the voice of Him who, by this illustrious miracle, gave one of the most convincing proofs that he was the Son of God, and confirmed the truth of His own words, "I am the resurrection and the life?" Such, as Bishop Hall beautifully and piously observes, is the voice we shall one day hear, sounding at the bottom of the grave, and which will raise us from the dust. Such the voice which will pierce the rocks, and divide the mountains, and bring up the dead out of the lowest depths: His word made all, and His word will repair all.

The remarkable history of the raising of Lazarus is omitted by St Matthew, St Mark, and St Luke, and this has been accounted for in a very satisfactory manner. It is the received tradition of the whole Church that Lazarus lived thirty

years after he was raised from the dead, and as he was consequently alive when the three Evangelists wrote their Gospels, they were restrained from pointing him out in such a particular manner as to expose him to the malice of the Jews, who had actually "consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death, because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus;" but when St John wrote Lazarus was dead, and it was necessary to record the event to perpetuate the memory of it for ever. Besides, during the lifetime of Lazarus it was well known, and there was no particular necessity for recording it. We are informed that on a particular occasion "much people of the Jews came not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also whom he had raised from the dead."

LEAH. See JACOB.

LEBBEUS, one of the Twelve Apostles, "whose surname was Thaddæus," is called "Judas the brother of James," who was the son of Alphaeus, Luke vi. 15, 16. He is called Jude at the end of his short Epistle, and probably Judas and Thaddæus or Theudas were the same name.

LEMUEL, mentioned in the last chapter of the Book of Proverbs, is understood to indicate Solomon himself by some interpreters, for the name, which signifies *one belonging to God*, might have been given to him as descriptive of his character, because God had expressly declared to Solomon that he would be to him a Father. It has, however, been also conjectured that the mother of Lemuel may have been a Jewess married to some neighbouring prince, or that she was Abijah, the daughter of the high priest Zechariah, and the mother of King Hezekiah.

LEVI, the third son of Jacob and Leah, and the head of the tribe of Levites, died in the hundred and thirty-seventh year of his age.

LOIS, the grandmother of Timothy, is honourably mentioned by St Paul, 1 Tim. i. 5.

LOT, the son of Haran, the brother of Abraham, was born about B.C. 1906.

The history of this ancient patriarchal chief is intimately connected with that of Abraham, to which the reader is referred in its proper place. The great increase of their cattle, and the "strife" of their respective herdsmen for pasturage, caused Lot and Abraham to separate, and the former directed his steps to the then fertile vale of Siddim, which contained the doomed Cities of the Plain, now covered by the waters of the Dead Sea. The Vale of Siddim was in those times traversed by the Jordan, which there is every reason for supposing passed through the valley called *El Ghor*, and fell into the Red Sea. Moses tells us that "Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the Plain of Jordan that it was well watered every where, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt as thou comest from Zoar. Then Lot chose him all the Plain of Jordan; and Lot journeyed east," and "pitched his tent toward Sodom," namely, he removed his tent from place to place till he came to Sodom, where he fixed. This choice of a locality by Lot was to him attended with the most important consequences. He selected the fruitful plain of the Jordan, without considering the character of the people among whom he intended to reside. This choice was made twenty years before Sodom was destroyed, but it is evident from the inspired narrative that he was well aware of the enormous wickedness and the abominable habits of the people. The consequence of this choice was what we often see exemplified to a greater or less degree in the case of men who consult their senses only, or who trust to mere external appearances, without duly reflecting on the *possibility*, if not the *probability*, of danger which may arise from their inconsideration. Lot lost all that he possessed, and if Abraham had not interceded with God for his deliverance, even his life was in danger.

Previous to the destruction of Sodom and its wretched inhabitants, two of the angels who had been entertained by Abraham proceeded towards Sodom in

the evening, at the gate of which they found Lot sitting. He rose to meet them, unconscious who they were, and invited them to his residence, with a request that they would remain all night. The mysterious strangers at first declined, but they afterwards accepted Lot's invitation, and sat down to an entertainment provided for them. Before they retired to rest, the residence of Lot was beset by a crowd of the guilty inhabitants of Sodom, who clamorously demanded that the strangers should be delivered up to them. The villanous assemblage would listen to none of Lot's expostulations, and after insulting him in a gross manner, pressed so close against the door of the house, that they were almost on the point of seizing the strangers, when the latter pulled Lot into his dwelling, and struck the wretched concourse "with blindness, both small and great, so that they wearied themselves to find the door." The strangers immediately informed Lot of the doom to be instantly inflicted on the guilty Cities of the Plain, with the exception of Zoar, the most insignificant of the others, which was appointed to him at his own request as a place of refuge. When he intimated the judgment of Jehovah to his two sons-in-law, they ridiculed him, and positively refused to leave the place; and even Lot himself, though he fully believed that every thing would be done which had been told him, made not that haste to escape which the necessity of the case required. The inspired historian informs us that "*while he lingered*, the men laid hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters; the Lord being merciful unto him, and they brought him forth, and set him without the city."

When Lot was thus led securely out of the city, he was solemnly urged to hasten to a place of shelter. "Escape for thy life, look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain; escape to the mountains, lest thou be consumed." The small town of Zoar already mentioned, which literally signifies *little*, was as-

signed to Lot, and he was enjoined to enter it with speed, as nothing would be done to the guilty cities until he arrived there. As soon as Lot was secure from danger, the plain where those cities stood, which up to that moment had been pleasant and fruitful, and "well watered like the garden of the Lord," changed its aspect, and the astonished inhabitants found themselves involved in the most awful calamity which can overtake any people. They seemed, as it were, in a fiery furnace of intense heat, from the fiercely scorching and glaring flames of which there was no possibility of escape. Their lungs ceased to play, and they panted for breath in that fearfully impregnated atmosphere. The ground beneath them seemed a mass of heaving liquid of fire; the bitumen with which it abounded became inflamed by lightning from heaven; above them the thunders of the angry Jehovah rolled in appalling horror, and the wrath of Omnipotence consigned them to destruction. The enormity of their crimes demanded a complete extirpation, and the very earth on which they had resided, and which they had contaminated, as it were, by their wickedness, was to disappear from human observation. The vale of Siddim was overflowed by the waters of the Jordan, after the purposes of Heaven had been accomplished, and the Dead Sea, the Salt Sea, the Lake of Sodom, or the Sea of the Plain—for by all these names it is distinguished—with its banks and adjacent districts of salt and sulphur, of briars and brambles, its unwholesome air, and its disagreeable water—remains to this hour a memorial of the just judgment of the Almighty Jehovah. This dreadful catastrophe was witnessed by the Patriarch Abraham, whose benevolent intercession in behalf of Sodom was of no avail, because not even ten righteous persons were found within it. He looked, we are told, "towards Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and, lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace." He turned his eyes towards the

once fertile plain where beauty had been conspicuous in the works of nature, and saw nothing but the smoke rising from the ground like the ruins of a burning world, devoted to destruction, as Tacitus observes of those very cities, by thunderbolts from heaven.

During the flight of Lot a remarkable incident occurred. His wife "looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt," which Josephus gravely assures us remained in his time, and which several travellers since his day pretend to have seen. But the text does not afford any ground for the common conclusion that Lot's wife became a pillar of rock salt. The word rendered *pillar* denotes any fixed object, and that rendered *salt* denotes also *bitumen*. It is evidently intimated in the text that this woman, who looked back to Sodom either from curiosity or from regret for leaving the place, was overwhelmed by the encroaching matter, which formed a mound over her, and fixed her where she stood. It is curious that the Mahometans have a tradition that Lot's wife was a very licentious woman, and they even allege that she abetted the inhabitants of Sodom in their infamous wickedness. There may be great exaggeration in this tradition, or there may be no truth in it at all, but the subsequent conduct of Lot's daughters seems to indicate that their notions of virtue had not been improved by their residence in Sodom, and the warning of our Saviour, to "remember Lot's wife," leads us to infer that a just punishment had overtaken her. "There are in Lot's story," observes Bishop Andrewes, "two very notable memorials of God's judgment—the Lake of Sodom, and Lot's wife's pillar. The one, the punishment of resolute sin; the other, of faint virtue; for the Sodomites are an example of impenitent wilful sinners, and Lot's wife of unpersevering and relapsing righteous persons."

The angels had instructed Lot to flee to the mountain, the usual resort in Oriental countries in times of danger, and he appears to have ultimately fol-

lowed their directions, though he in the first instance was allowed to reside in Zoar. We are informed that "Lot went up out of Zoar, and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him, for he feared to dwell in Zoar; and he dwelt in a cave, he and his two daughters with him." There is nothing extraordinary in his resorting to such a place as a residence, for caves were probably the original dwellings of mankind; the mountains of Canaan, in particular, abound with them, some of which are of vast extent; and it is still customary for the shepherds to occupy them, and to shelter their cattle in them while pasturing in the neighbourhood. It was in this secluded residence that the only other transaction of Lot's life recorded by Moses took place, over which a veil must be cast, as utterly inexplicable in a satisfactory manner. Of the fact itself there can be no doubt, but the necessity of it constitutes the difficulty, more especially when we consider the relationship of the parties, and the character of Lot, who is called "just" or righteous by St Peter, and who is described as being "vexed with filthy conversation." Lot became the common ancestor of the Moabites and the Ammonites in the extraordinary manner narrated by Moses, and if we are to judge of this mysterious arrangement, and of the manner in which it was accomplished, by those laws and ordinances, divine and human, which, as responsible to God and man, we are bound and indeed are compelled to obey, we must, to quote the language of the pious Bishop Wilson, be convinced by this remarkable narrative "of the frailty of human nature without the grace of God, when we read the account of Lot's intemperance after so great a deliverance; and if we have any concern for our salvation we shall dread a vice which will lead man to the greatest of crimes." After the short account of the origin of Moab and Ammon, the inspired historian records no farther particulars of Lot, and in imitation thereof it is necessary to stop our inquiries, and consign him to the oblivion which

the transaction demands, and which, from the nature of the narrative, seems to forbid all speculation.

The Rabbins call Lot's wife *Hedith*, but as this word simply means *a witness*, it may have a reference solely to her punishment. The Mahometans designate Lot by the names of Louth and Laouth, and allege that he preached to the inhabitants of Sodom twenty years with great zeal. They pretend that the destruction of Sodom was partly effected by God throwing down upon them burning stones, and even those who were without the compass of the Cities of the Plain were killed by them. As an instance of this, one of those persons, being by chance in the temple of Mecca at the time of the catastrophe, continued there secure for forty days, but he no sooner went out of it than he was struck down and killed.

LUKE, or LUCAS, WAS author of the Gospel which goes under his name, and of the Acts of the Apostles. A learned writer of a historical biography of this Evangelist (Mr Taylor) has attempted with great labour and erudition to prove that St Luke is the same person as "Lucius of Cyrene," mentioned in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts; but the proof rests on no very satisfactory ground, nor do we think it of great consequence to support his credibility as an authentic historian to establish that identity. Whether or not the two names are only the Greek and Latin forms to indicate the same individual, almost all the ancient ecclesiastical historians agree that he was educated at least, if not born, at Antioch. In that celebrated metropolis of Syria there were ample opportunities for him to become master of all the learning of the age, Jewish as well as Heathen. We are also informed by the rather credulous author Metaphrastes, that he studied not only in the schools of the capital of Syria, but also in those of Greece and Egypt. We have good reason to conclude that he was the "beloved physician" mentioned by St Paul to the Colossians. There was a tradition, also, that besides physic he studied painting, and the Romish Church

pretends that there are several portraits still in existence executed by this Evangelist!

St Luke's name indicates that he was not of Jewish parentage, and Paul sending the salutations of his friends to the Colossians does not class him with those "of the circumcision." From the circumstance of his having been long the companion and fellow-labourer of this Apostle, it is supposed by Nicephorus that he was converted to Christianity by the preaching of St Paul; but there is not the slightest evidence of this in the writings of the New Testament. It has been conjectured with more probability that he was in early life a proselyte to Judaism, and that during his visits to the Jewish festivals he had heard the gospel from Christ himself, and became one of his converts and constant disciples. Epiphanius, indeed, mentions that St Luke, as well as St Mark, was one of the seventy sent out to preach in the towns and villages, on our Saviour's last journey to Jerusalem. There is no direct evidence against this, but the probability is that none but a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" was employed in this message. His own introduction to his Gospel has been produced as a proof that he was not a convert to the belief of the Gospel so early—that he was not an "eye-witness and minister of the Word," but his words, simply considered, lead to the opposite conclusion, as Whitby and Bishop Gleig are decidedly of opinion. He says that many of those eye-witnesses had *undertaken* to give a relation of the things fully believed among the Christians, and "he also having had a perfect knowledge of all things from the very first, resolved to write a narrative of them in order," that his friend Theophilus "might know the certainty of the doctrines in which he had been instructed." Macknight, in his Harmony, argues that this Evangelist was the first of all the inspired writers who composed a narrative of the miracles and doctrines of Christ, and that those other relations to which Luke alludes were inaccurate and unauthorized production

disseminated among the early Christians by well-meaning but ill informed men. As to this statement we neither reject nor fully assent to it, but the minute and particularly graphic description which he gives of the circumstances accompanying and following the resurrection has all the characteristics of coming from the pen of an eye-witness. From his being the only Evangelist who has given an account of the journey of Cleopas and *another* disciple to Emmaus, and the conciseness with which he relates the whole particulars of the conversation and feelings of these disciples, it is supposed by ancient and modern writers that St Luke was that other disciple, suppressing like St John in similar instances, his own name. The same remark as to his particularity of description and his reports of conversations applies to the first chapters of the Acts, and in cases of common evidence would be held as sufficient proof that the narrator was an eye-witness of what he relates. If this was really the case, we are entitled to conclude with Epiphanius that St Luke was one of those to whom the Holy Ghost was given on the ever-memorable day of Pentecost.

One of the ancients already quoted quaintly remarks, that "as the Apostles from catchers of fish became fishers of men, so Luke from a physician of the body became a physician of the soul." But though he has most fully of all the other sacred writers recorded the labours and sufferings of the Apostles and Evangelists, we cannot so particularly trace his own history. If the above reasoning is correct, he remained at Jerusalem till after the martyrdom of Stephen, and probably witnessed the conduct of Saul the persecutor, whose beloved fellow-labourer he afterwards became. We may suppose that he was one of those who "were scattered abroad upon the persecution which rose about Stephen," and that he was also one of those who, he mentions, travelled as far as his own native city Antioch, at first "preaching the word to none but Jews only." But after the conversion of Cornelius, and the manifesta-

tion of what was a mystery to the Jews, "that God had granted to the Gentiles also repentance unto life," Luke informs us that they then began "to preach to the Hellenists, and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." From the strain of the succeeding narrative it is clear that the Evangelist was both a witness and "a fellow-labourer" in this work. Here, we also conclude, he formed his first acquaintance with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, though he does not appear to have regularly travelled and laboured in his company till about ten years afterwards, when St Paul, by immediate revelation of the Spirit, was directed to leave Asia for the time, and pass over into Europe. This took place at Troas, and from this time till the close of the history of the Acts the Evangelist was the almost constant attendant of St Paul in his various labours throughout Macedonia and Greece, in his journeys to Asia, to Jerusalem—was witness of his arrangement and persecution by the Jews—sailed with him to Rome when he appealed from the injustice of his countrymen—and lived with him during his two years' residence in that city. Here it is certain that St Luke was of great service to the Apostle in dispatching or carrying the various letters and messages sent to those churches which he was prevented from visiting, but after whose welfare his ardent mind was continually longing.

Respecting the Acts of the Apostles, that work is not a regular or full history of the Church during the period of more than thirty years which it embraces; but it is of infinite value to Christians of all ages in showing the terrible struggle which truth had at first to maintain with error, and virtue with vice. It was not only at Jerusalem and throughout Judea that the followers of Christ were despised, or hated, or persecuted. In other countries their doctrine was spoken against, and their uncompromising denunciation of all idolatry and wickedness made them to be received almost everywhere as incendiaries—as men who wished

"to turn the world upside down." We would say that this history was a necessary, as it is an infinitely important, sequel to the Gospels, showing how that "grain of mustard-seed" spread its boughs like the cedars of Lebanon, and overshadowed the world with the verdure of its foliage, and refreshed its inhabitants with the exuberant richness of its fruit—how that small band of poor and ignorant and dispirited followers were proceeding in their victorious work of subduing the world to obedience to the Prince of peace and the reign of righteousness. We know, besides, that Christ during his personal ministry on earth withheld many of the mysteries of his kingdom from his disciples, because "they could not bear them then." In this history we have the gradual unfolding of the full application of the doctrines of the cross—their spiritual extension beyond the material services and symbolic rites of Judaism—their adaptation to all times and all circumstances, and to all characters. It is the connecting link between the Gospels and Epistles, and throws light upon numerous allusions to facts and circumstances in them which we could never have understood without such a commentary. St Luke had written his Gospel before the Acts, but whether at Antioch, or at Rome, or in Achaia, it is difficult to decide. If, as Ignatius and some others suppose, the Apostle Paul alludes to Luke as "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel in all the churches," we may safely conclude that he had written that narrative before he went to Rome, and that it was already universally known and read. It is certain that he composed it for the instruction of the Gentile converts, and he is therefore supposed to be more particular in mentioning facts and circumstances connected with the history of the Jews, and which influenced or explain the conduct of the Divine subject of his biography, or which throw light upon the motives of the human agents who appear prominently in our Saviour's history, than any of the other three Evangelists. The Greek style, which he uses,

is also more classical and more free from solecisms than that of the others, not even excepting St Paul. He sometimes employs words and phrases from the Latin and Hebrew, but it is only when the language which he uses cannot otherwise so accurately express the idea which he wishes to convey. His flowing, eloquent, and lofty style has always been considered as peculiarly adapted to historical narrative; and though there is no proof that he was a *painter* in the literal acceptance of the word, yet as a *historical painter*, who by graphic touches exhibits the characters of those of whom he writes as living and acting before his readers, he may stand a comparison, even as an uninspired writer, with Thucydides or Livy.

After St Paul left Rome, which was about A.D. 62, we have no farther authentic account of St Luke's life or labours. Some state that he returned to the East even before St Paul left Rome, and that he preached the gospel in Libya and Egypt; others, that he travelled for the same purpose into France, then through Italy, Dalmatia, and Macedonia, and even into Asia. If he was about the age of eighty, as has been supposed, at the last separation from St Paul, such a laborious undertaking is very far from probable. History is not agreed whether he died in peace, or the death of a martyr. Nicephorus mentions a story that St Luke, preaching in Greece, and having made and baptized many converts, excited the rage of the unbelieving, who attacked him, and, in want of any other means of execution, hanged him upon an olive tree. Others report that he was left by Paul at Rome to labour in his absence, and was soon after put to death there, which, they allege, was the reason why his history of the Apostles' Acts was not finished by him. With such conflicting accounts the safest course is to conclude that nothing certain is now known regarding his death.

LYDIA, a Christian of great piety and virtue, was a native of Thyatira, but was resident at Philippi, where she followed

the occupation of a seller of purple. After her conversion to Christianity she showed the greatest hospitality towards St Paul and his companions.

LYSANIAS, the tetrarch of Abilene

in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, is only casually mentioned by the Evangelist St Luke. Nothing particular is recorded respecting this officer connected with the inspired narrative.

M

MACCABEES, an illustrious Jewish family, whose history and transactions, though not alluded to or included in the canonical Scriptures, cannot with propriety be omitted in this work. The Apocryphal Books of the Maccabees were never reckoned inspired by the Primitive Church, but they are—especially the First Book—cited as a respectable history by the Fathers, and they have always been held as furnishing some valuable illustrations of Jewish history during the times to which they refer, long after the succession of Prophets had ceased among the Jews. The periods between the conclusion of the Old Testament Canon and the commencement of the Gospel history, which embrace events not of course recorded in the Bible, and in the historical Books of the Apocrypha, are usually divided in such a manner as to include, first, the Jewish history from the death of Nehemiah to the commencement of the history of the Maccabees; and, second, from the conclusion of the Maccabees to the commencement of the Gospel history. It will thus be seen that the history and transactions of the Maccabees occupy the intervening period, and to this interesting record of ancient story the attention of the reader is now directed.

The Books of the Maccabees properly commence with the persecution carried on against the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria. That tyrant, B.C. 167, issued an edict at Antioch, the capital of his kingdom, and caused it to be proclaimed throughout all the Syrian provinces, commanding the inhabitants to worship the objects of his idolatry,

and to acknowledge no religion except that which he professed. To his pagan subjects such an edict was no hardship, though it produced serious effects among the disciples of Zoroaster in Armenia and Persia, whose tradition that their sacred books were destroyed by Alexander the Great probably owes its real origin to this edict of Antiochus Epiphanes, with whom such records would find no more favour than the sacred books of the Jews. The degenerate Samaritans, who found it convenient for their own purposes to claim a Jewish origin in the time of Alexander the Great, wrote to Antiochus at the promulgation of his edict, and asserted that they were Zidonians, offering at the same time to dedicate their temple on Mount Gerizim to the Grecian Jupiter. Many Jews submitted for fear of punishment, and numbers, long attached to the idolatrous customs of the Greeks, embraced this opportunity to renounce the religion of their fathers, and to declare themselves in favour of the Syrians. But the great majority, and especially those of the better order, fled, or kept themselves concealed.

An aged man, named Athenæus, was sent to Jerusalem to instruct the Jews in the tenets of the Greek mythology, and to compel them to the observance of its rites. The Temple was dedicated by him to Jupiter Olympius, and on the altar of Jehovah he placed a smaller altar to be used in sacrificing to the Gentile idol. In compliance with the request of the Samaritans, who had pretended in their letter to Antiochus that they were strangers in the country, this Athenæus

dedicated the temple on Mount Gerizim to Jupiter Xenios, or the Protector of Strangers. On the 25th of the month Chisleu, which corresponds to our December, the heathen sacrifices were commenced in the Temple of the true God at Jerusalem, and the holy city was defiled by the idolatries of pagan superstition. The observation of the Sabbath, or of any part of the Mosaic ritual, was made a capital offence; groves were planted, and idolatrous altars erected in every city; the inhabitants were required to offer sacrifices to the gods, and at the feast of Bacchus they were ordered to walk in procession crowned with ivy. Officers were sent into all the towns throughout Judea, attended by bands of soldiers to enforce obedience to the edict of Epiphanes.

The Jews were now subjected to the most relentless persecution they had ever encountered, yet so resolute were the mass of them in adhering to their religion, that neither the threats nor the tortures of their enemies could force them to apostatize. It happened that an officer named Apelles was sent to a town west of Jerusalem near the sea-shore called Modin, to execute the orders of the king of Syria. In this place resided Mattathias, one of the principal inhabitants, and a priest of the fourth sacerdotal class, who was the son of Johanan, or John, and the great-grandson of Hasmon or Asmoneus. He had five sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan, but to Judas the surname of Maccabæus was peculiar, whose motto on his standard was a Hebrew sentence taken from the Book of Exodus (xv. 11) not written at length, but by an abbreviation formed of the initial letters, which made the word *Macabi*, and consequently all who afterwards fought under his standard were called *Maccabees* or *Maccabæans*, Judas having the name by way of eminence because he was the leader. Others, however, derive the term from the Hebrew words *Makhe-baiah*, which means *a conqueror in the Lord*, and this agrees with his father's account of him, that "he

had been mighty and strong even from his youth." The name Maccabæus is properly applied chiefly to Judas, and when mentioned singly means that Jewish leader, but it is also bestowed on his brothers to distinguish them from others of the same name.

Apelles attempted with fair promises to persuade Mattathias to comply with the edict of Antiochus Epiphanes, and to offer sacrifice to the mythological idol. "Thou," said the Syrian officer, "art a ruler, and an honourable and great man in this city, and strengthened with sons and brethren; now, therefore, come thou first, and fulfil the king's commandment, like as all the heathen have done, yea, and the men of Judah also, and such as remain at Jerusalem; so shalt thou and thy house be in the number of the king's friends, and thou and thy children shall be honoured with silver and gold, and many rewards." Mattathias indignantly rejected his offers, and in the hearing of the whole assembly refused to offer sacrifice. On that occasion a certain apostate Jew approached the idolatrous altar with the intention of sacrificing, but the zealous priest, in obedience to the Law of Moses, killed him at the altar with his own hand as a rebel against Jehovah. He then rushed on the officer and his attendants, and with the assistance of his sons and some Jews who were emboldened by his courage, he inflicted upon them mortal wounds, and destroyed the altar of idolatry. Mattathias then exclaimed throughout the city—"Whosoever is zealous of the Law, and maintaineth the covenant, let him follow me." He was soon joined by many Jews who were determined to maintain the religion of their fathers, and fled to the mountainous fastnesses of Judea.

This daring exploit was intimated to Apollonius, the chief collector of the Syrian tribute, who commanded the strong garrison on Mount Zion at Jerusalem. A body of troops was sent into the wilderness to seize Mattathias and his fugitive followers, and having overtaken

them, preparations were made for battle on their Sabbath day. Terms of reconciliation and forgiveness were offered to the Jews if they would submit, which they resolutely rejected, and at the same time they refused to fight on their Sabbath day, adhering too closely to the letter of the Law without comprehending its spirit, and construing it the more strictly out of hatred to the laxity and impiety of their countrymen who had joined the Greeks. They interpreted the Law concerning the rest of the seventh day literally, and thought it criminal even to defend their own lives, or to adopt any means for their own security. They replied—"Let us die all in our innocence; heaven and earth shall testify for us that ye put us to death wrongfully." The consequence of this extravagant resolution was what might have been expected. About a thousand persons, including women and children, were put to the sword on the Sabbath day, not far from Jerusalem, without offering the least resistance. This disaster, which the Jews might have easily avoided, completely proved to Mattathias and his followers that they had misunderstood the Law, and they resolved unanimously to fight in their own defence, but not to make an attack on the Sabbath.

The standard of revolt was now boldly unfurled by the Maccabæans, who resolved to recover the independence of their nation. The followers of Mattathias continually increased, and not only great numbers of the Assideans, who in their religious observances even exceeded the demands of the Law, joined him, but even many of the party called Zadduceans, who regarded only the written Law, and discarded any interpretations of it, resorted to his banner. They soon formed a considerable army, and Mattathias emerged at their head from his concealment, went throughout the towns, demolished the idolatrous altars, circumcised the children, killed the apostate Jews and the Syrian officers, recovered several copies of the Law which had been carried away, and gained several import-

ant advantages. But while engaged in these victorious expeditions Mattathias, who was far advanced in life, found his end approaching, and before his death he called together his sons, charged them to be "zealous for the Law," and to "give their lives for the covenant of their fathers." He appointed Judas, his third son, military leader, and associated with him Simon, his second son, who was to act as counsellor. Mattathias died in the year B.C. 166, and was interred in the sepulchre of his ancestors at Modin, amid the tears and lamentations of all the Jews who remained faithful to the religion of their fathers.

Judas Maccabæus followed the example of his deceased father, and continued to purify Judea from idolaters. While Antiochus Epiphanes was amusing himself at his capital of Antioch with the most ridiculous frolics, Judas was busily engaged in obtaining possession of several cities, and providing them with garrisons. In the events which follow we shall see this brave chief, with his valiant brothers, maintaining a religious war for twenty-six years, from the time of the insurrection of Modin, with five successive kings of Syria, and at length establishing the independence of their country and the aggrandizement of their family. "Such a triumph of a petty province over a great empire," observes Dr Hales, "is scarcely to be paralleled in the annals of history; but the Lord fought for Israel while they were religious and virtuous, and put their whole trust in Him. The inflexible spirit of the Jewish nation has ever grown more rigid under persecution, and their zeal has waxed hotter in the furnace of adversity." Judas defeated Apollonius the governor of Samaria, in all probability the same Apollonius sent by Antiochus to plunder Jerusalem, and to set up the statue of Jupiter Olympius in the Temple. The Jewish victor obtained the sword of Apollonius in this battle, with which, says the author of the Maccabees, he "fought all his life long." Seron, the deputy-governor of Cælo-Syria under

Ptolemy Macro, who had advanced to the heights near Beth-horon with all his army, was the next who sustained a signal defeat with a considerable loss from Judas. These successful conflicts not only confirmed the courage of the Jews, but inured them to war, while their fallen enemies supplied them with arms and other necessities.

The tidings of the Jewish victories roused the indignation of Antiochus, and he determined to extirpate the whole nation, and to give their country to others. He gathered together a considerable army, and gave his troops one year's pay, but he had exhausted his treasury by expensive games and extravagant donations, and he found it difficult to raise such a force as he required. At the same time he received intelligence that the Persians and the tributary Armenians had positively refused to make any more remittances—the effect of his religious persecution of the followers of Zoroaster in that country, who abhorred the worship of idols, and whose sacred books he had destroyed; but as his authority did not extend to Media and Bactria, Antiochus was in consequence obliged to weaken his forces by dividing them in his campaign against his revolted tributaries. He soon subdued the Armenians, and then marched against the Persians in person. The division of his army destined for Judea was placed under the command of Lysias, a nobleman of royal blood, to whom he committed the care of his son, the heir to his crown, then only seven years old, constituting him at the same time regent of the countries west of the Euphrates until his return.

Philip, governor of Judea, Ptolemy Macro, and Lysias, collected an army of forty thousand foot and seven thousand horse to oppose Judas and his brave followers. One half of this army was commanded by Nicanor, who was accompanied by Gorgias, an experienced soldier; the other half was led by Ptolemy Macro, the commander-in-chief, who formed a junction with Nicanor at Emmaus, a few miles from Jerusalem. As it was

in those times customary for slave-dealers to attend the march of armies, they were joined by many Syrians, and by some hundreds of merchants, who came for the purpose of purchasing such Jews as would be taken prisoners. To this force Judas could oppose only six thousand men, and after commending themselves to the Divine protection at Maspha, otherwise Mizpeh, the sacred place of national assemblies in more ancient times (Judges xx. 1; 1 Sam. vii. 5), he separated them into three divisions. The small army of Judas became less by the withdrawing of those who by the Law of Moses (Deut. xx. 5) were exempt from military duty, for “such as were building houses, or had betrothed wives, or were planting vineyards, or were fearful, those he commanded that they should return, every man to his own house, according to the Law;” and so many, doubtless terrified by the numbers of their enemies, took advantage of this law, that it appears only three thousand remained with their leader. Although thus reduced to one half of his original force, Judas, confiding in the help of God, resolved to meet his Syrian foes the next day, when he was informed that Gorgias designed to attack him by surprise during the night with five thousand foot and one thousand horse. He determined to strike a decisive blow. He left his encampment on the south side of Emmaus early in the evening, and rushed on the forces of Nicanor in the night, who, not expecting any attack, forsook their camp in confusion, and commenced a hasty flight. No fewer than three thousand Syrian soldiers were put to the sword, and many were made prisoners, including numbers of the slave-dealers already noticed. Nicanor escaped to Antioch in the disguise of a slave, and was forced to acknowledge that “the Jews had God to fight for them, and therefore they could not be hurt, because they followed the laws that He gave them.” Meanwhile Gorgias made his intended attack on the Maccabean camp, but to his surprise he found it empty, and he concluded that the Jews

had fled through fear, although they were at that time engaged in the pursuit and slaughter of Nicanor's fugitive army. Judas returned from the pursuit, and advised his followers—"Be not greedy of the spoils, inasmuch as there is a battle before us; and Gorgias and his host are here by us in the mountain; but stand ye now against our enemies, and overcome them, and after this ye may boldly take the spoils." Gorgias in astonishment saw the Syrian camp in flames; his soldiers in a panic immediately fled, and were pressed so furiously by the Jews, that great numbers of them were wounded and slain. In the camp of the Syrians the Jews found "much gold and silver, and blue silk, and purple of the sea, and great riches." They celebrated this victory by a festival, and, says the author of the Book of Maccabees, they "sung a song of thanksgiving, and praised the Lord in heaven, because He is good, because His mercy endureth for ever."

This victory secured to Judas Maccabæus a great accession of followers, and made the Jews the more confident in their resistance. When Lysias was informed of the defeat of the Syrian troops, he led an army in person, consisting of sixty thousand foot and five thousand horse, into Idumea, and marched through that ancient territory of the Edomites to invade the Jews. He besieged Bethsura, originally built by King Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 7), and more recently rebuilt by the Idumeans; but while he was investing this frontier fortress, which lay south-west of Jerusalem, he was attacked by Judas with ten thousand men, who put him to flight, and killed five thousand of his soldiers. This so completely disheartened the troops of Lysias that a general desertion took place, and their commander was forced to retire to Antioch, where he raised recruits for a new expedition.

While Lysias was occupied in procuring foreign mercenaries, Judas, who was now master of the whole country, announced to his followers—"Behold, our enemies are discomfited; let us go up

to cleanse and dedicate [or repair] the sanctuary." The Jews immediately marched to Jerusalem, and took possession of Mount Zion. We are informed that "when they saw the sanctuary desolate, and the altar profaned, and the gates burned up, and shrubs growing in the courts as a forest, or as on one of the mountains, yea, and the priests' chambers pulled down, they rent their clothes, and made great lamentations, and cast ashes upon their heads, and fell flat to the ground upon their faces, and blew an alarm with the trumpets, and cried toward heaven." Having appointed a chosen party to dislodge the Syrian garrison from the fortress, the work of repairing the sacred edifice was carried on with great vigour. New utensils were provided for the services, and the old altar, which had been polluted by idolatrous sacrifices, was taken away, and a new one erected. The Mosaic sacrifices were recommenced on the 25th of the month Chisleu (December), the same day on which three years before the Temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympius. This new dedication was celebrated for eight days with great joy, and it was resolved to observe it annually in commemoration of the event. This festival was known in after times as the *Feast of the Dedication*, and was continued to the eighth day, as were the passover and the feast of tabernacles, during all the time of which the Jews illuminated their houses by setting lights at every door, whence it was also designated the *Feast of Lights*. It is worthy of notice that, though there was no divine command for the institution of this festival, and no example of any inspired prophet for the observance of it—although, in a word, it was a mere human institution, our blessed Saviour, nearly two centuries afterwards, honoured it with his presence at Jerusalem, proceeding thither purposely to bear his part in the solemnity, which certainly implies his approbation. From this fact the learned Grotius infers that festival days in commemoration of public blessings or deliverances may be instituted by persons in authority

without a divine command, or even without the example of a person divinely directed observing the same. Such festivals were known among the Jews; they are known and observed in the Christian Church, although it is not pretended that there is any divine authority for their institution; and they are known in our own country, by the recurrence of certain holidays enjoined as annual commemorations of particular events in our national history.

But the apostate Jews and others still held the fortress of Mount Zion, and the general joy for the restoration of the public services of religion was often interrupted by frequent sallies from that stronghold in which several persons who were repairing to the Temple were occasionally slain. The army of Judas was so small, that he could not leave in Jerusalem a force sufficient to hold the fortress in a state of blockade, but he fortified the Temple by surrounding it with a high and strong wall furnished with towers, on which he stationed soldiers to protect the worshippers from the assaults of the garrison. He at the same time strengthened the frontier fortress of Bethsura, "that the people might have a defence against Idumea." These proceedings of the Jews roused the hatred of their neighbours, who began to view them as enemies to their king and their deities, and who "thereupon began to slay and destroy the people"—namely, they committed hostilities on such Jews as fell into their power. The Idumeans, who inhabited the southern parts of Judea, and the Beanites (or Hakanites, Gen. xxxvi. 27; Numb. xxxiii. 31, 32), probably a tribe of nomade Arabs whose locality was near the confines of the Dead Sea, lay in wait for the Jews near the public roads, and slew all who came in their way. Judas marched against those troublesome enemies, and "destroyed them utterly, and burned the towers of their places with fire, and all that were therein." He next turned his victorious army against Timotheus, chief of the hostile Ammonites, with whom he fought

"many battles, till at length they were discomfited before him, and he smote them." Timotheus was slain in one of those battles, 2 Macc. x. 24-38. Bacchides his ally was defeated, and all the country about Jazer, a town which originally belonged to the Ammonites, was subdued.

The idolatrous inhabitants of the districts east of the Jordan lost many relatives in these battles between Judas and Timotheus, and they revenged themselves on those Jews who resided among them by putting many to the sword, and making slaves of their wives and children. In the country of Tobie (called Tob, Judges xi. 3, 5, and the people Tubieni, 2 Macc. xii. 17) not one Jew escaped. Several from other places had taken refuge in the fortress of Dathema, where they were besieged by another Timotheus. The people of Ptolemais, Tyre, Zidon, and the neighbouring Philistine cities, united to destroy the Jews of Galilee, in which they were encouraged, if not instigated, by the Syrian governor, who hoped that all these attacks would accomplish the purpose of the king, and eventually annihilate the Jewish nation and religion.

The Jews besieged in Dathema by the pagan chief Timotheus, and those assailed by the inhabitants of the towns now mentioned, sent letters to Judas, representing to him their distress, and imploring his assistance. A council was immediately summoned, and three thousand men marched into Galilee under the command of Simon, the brother of Judas, who defeated the enemy in several battles, and conducted the Jews of those districts, with their wives and children, to Judea, as it was otherwise impossible to secure them from the assaults of their foes. While Simon was pursuing this victorious career in Galilee, and chasing the enemy to the very gates of Ptolemais, Judas, attended by his youngest brother Jonathan, marched into Gilead to relieve Dathema at the head of eight thousand men. After a march of three days in the deserts east of the Jor-

dan, he entered the country of the Nabathæan Arabs, from whom he obtained accurate information of the state of affairs in that quarter—that many of the Jews were shut up in Bosor, Alema, Maked, Carnaim, and other cities—and that “against to-morrow they [the Pagans] had appointed to bring their host against the forts, and to take them, and to destroy them all in one day.” This intelligence induced Judas to advance instantly against Bosor, which he surprised, laid in ashes, and put all the male inhabitants to the sword. He then marched all night, and early in the morning attacked the besiegers of Dathema, who instantly fled when they knew that Judas was opposing them in person, “wherefore he smote them with a great slaughter, so that there were killed of them that day about eight thousand men.” After this exploit Judas took Maspha (Mizpeh), Casphor, Maked, Bosor, and other cities of Gilead, put all the males to the sword, gave up the houses to pillage, and laid them in ashes. Among these expeditions was the conquest of the city of Caspes, of which an account is given in the Second Book of Maccabees (xii. 13–16), and which is probably the same as Casphor. Timotheus drew up a numerous army, composed of several Arab allies, and encamped at Raphon, but Judas defeated him, took possession of Carnion, or Carnaim, and burnt the temple of Atargatis. A particular account of this expedition is also given in the Second Book of the Maccabees (xii. 19–31), from which it appears that Timotheus himself fell into the hands of Dosithæus and Sosipater, two of the captains of Judas, “whom he besought with much craft to let him go with his life, because he had many of the Jews’ parents, and the brethren of some of them, who, if they put him to death, should not be regarded; so when he had assured them with many words that he would restore them without hurt, according to the agreement, they let him go for the sake of their brethren.”

As the Jews in those regions were continually exposed to new hostilities.

though they had humbled their enemies, Judas deemed it expedient to transfer them—“from the least unto the greatest, even their wives and their children, and their stuff, a very great host”—to Judea. By these accessions the strength of the nation was concentrated, and Jerusalem supplied with inhabitants. Judas in his return also conquered the city of Ephron, the gates of which had been closed against him. It is not known, however, what was the particular situation of Ephron. The author seems to imply that the country about it was impassable, or so full of morasses that the Jewish army must have been lost if they had been obliged to “turn from it either on the right hand or the left.” They were consequently under the necessity of passing through the town, which was “a great city, in the way as they should go, very well fortified;” and Judas requested permission to do so, assuring the inhabitants that he would not do them any hurt, as all he wished was a passage to his own country. Grotius properly observes that this refusal of the inhabitants to let the Jews pass, after their solemn promise that they would march through quietly and inoffensively, was an act contrary to the just rights of human society. Judas, after taking the city, plundering it, and putting all the males to the sword, came to Bethshan, otherwise Scythopolis, west of the Jordan. He expressed his gratitude to the citizens for their kind treatment of the Jews who resided among them, and at length he arrived safely at Jerusalem.

Judas, during his absence, had appointed Joseph and Azarias, two of his captains, to superintend the city of Jerusalem, with express orders that they should keep within the walls, and make no attack on the enemy. They nevertheless chose to assault Jamnia, and were repulsed with considerable loss by Gorgias the governor. It was probably to avenge this defeat that Judas, after ravaging Hebron and the adjacent territory of the Idumeans, invaded the country of the Philistines, and took Ashdod, which

he purged of idolatrous altars and images. Antiochus Epiphanes was informed of all these successes of the Jews when he was at Elymais in Persia—a city celebrated for its prodigiously rich temple. He was there detained by an insurrection of the people, occasioned by his robbing that edifice—a circumstance mentioned both by Polybius and Diodorus Siculus. Vexed and harassed, he set out with a determination to exterminate the Jews, but during his journey he was seized with a painful disease, and was in addition tormented by the reproaches of his conscience for his crimes. He died at Tabæ, a place on the borders of Persia and Babylonia, in the year B.C. 163, and in the eleventh of his reign. Coins of this monarch, the son of the celebrated Antiochus the Great, are still extant. Epiphanes bitterly lamented the sacrilege he had committed at Jerusalem, and made many vows to repair the evil if he recovered; but his repentance was too late, and he was fully sensible that all his sufferings were from the hand of God.

Antiochus Epiphanes was succeeded by his son Antiochus, then nine years old, who received the surname of *Eupator*, which means *of a good father*, a distinction bestowed on him, Appian tells us, out of compliment to his father. It is previously noticed that the young prince had been left under the care of Lysias, who determined not to relinquish such an important charge. Epiphanes had appointed his favourite, named Philip, to be regent and guardian to his son, but Lysias paid no attention to that arrangement, and Philip finding himself too weak to assert his right, fled to Egypt, where he hoped to procure assistance to depose Lysias from his usurped authority. Meanwhile the Jews were kindly treated by Ptolemy Macron, but it was of short continuance, for when that officer saw that he was despised as a traitor for betraying the island of Cyprus into the hands of the deceased Antiochus Epiphanes when he held it as Egyptian governor, he poisoned himself. Lysias invaded Judea with an immense army, composed of infantry and

cavalry, and a number of elephants, but he was repulsed by Judas at the siege of Bethsura, with the loss of eleven thousand foot and sixteen hundred horse, and his whole army was broken up. This disaster induced him to conclude peace with Judas on reasonable terms, and the Roman ambassadors, Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius, rendered efficient assistance in this negotiation.

Judas now laid siege to the fortress of Acra on Mount Zion, held by the Syrian garrison, where he was exposed to a new invasion by an immense Syrian army, so numerous and powerful that the Jews could offer no open resistance. While they were besieging Bethsura, Judas attacked them during the night, and before they were aware who had entered their camp, he slew four thousand men, and retired in safety by break of day. On the following morning they came to battle, and Judas was forced to retire to Jerusalem, that he might not be surrounded by the numbers of the enemy. In this battle he lost his younger brother Eleazar, also called Savaran, or Auran, who fell in achieving a deed of desperate valour. "Perceiving," says the author of the Maccabees, "that one of the beasts [the elephants] armed with royal harness, was higher than all the rest, and supposing that the king was upon him, Eleazar put himself in jeopardy, to the end he might deliver his people, and get him a perpetual name, wherefore he ran upon him courageously through the midst of the battle, slaying on the right hand and on the left, so that they were divided from him on both sides. Which done, he crept under the elephant, and thrust him under, and slew him, whereupon the elephant fell down upon him, and there he died."

The Jews were reduced to great distress; Bethsura surrendered, and Jerusalem was closely besieged. Alcimus, the high priest appointed by Antiochus Eupator, whom they refused to acknowledge, prepared for them new distresses, and preferred complaints to the king, Demetrius Soter, against Judas and the Assideans, charging them with continuing

in disobedience, contrary to the orders of their sovereign. This representation had the desired effect with Demetrius, who, B.C. 161, sent an army into Judea, under the command of Bacchides, with instructions to establish Alcimus in his office of the high priesthood by force, and to put an end to the insurrection. Judas retired before Bacchides, and that officer, after confirming the authority of Alcimus, withdrew his troops, leaving with the high priest a force thought sufficient for his security. No sooner had Bacchides left the country than Judas again made his appearance, and punished the apostate Jews with great severity. Alcimus was compelled to proceed again to Antioch, to renew his complaints against Judas. Demetrius sent another army into Judea, under the command of Nicanor, "one of his honourable princes, a man that bare deadly hate unto Israel," who had orders to kill Judas, or to take him prisoner, and to secure Alcimus in the quiet possession of his office. Nicanor came to Jerusalem, and at first disguised his real intentions by appearing as a friend. He sent this message—"Let there be no battle between me and you; I will come with a few men, that I may see you in peace." Nicanor, who is noticed in the outset of this narrative, was well acquainted with the prowess of Judas, by whom he had been vanquished in a former expedition, and he was evidently reluctant to make another trial. It appears that he had an interview with Judas, and "they saluted one another peaceably," but as soon as Judas ascertained that Nicanor's conduct was assumed, he was "sore afraid of him," namely, he was vigilantly on his guard, and "would see his face no more." The Syrian general soon threw off the mask, and made every exertion to get Judas into his power, but all his efforts were unsuccessful, and the Jewish leader escaped. Hostilities were openly renewed, and Nicanor ravaged the country with his troops, sparing neither age nor sex.

A battle was fought at a place not far from Jerusalem called Capharsalama, or

Semelia, in which Nicanor was defeated with considerable loss, and forced to seek refuge in the castle of Mount Zion. From this fortress he sent a party of soldiers to seize a Jew of great influence and piety, named Razis, but he laid violent hands on himself rather than fall into the power of his enemies. We are informed that when Nicanor went to Mount Zion, "there came out of the sanctuary certain of the priests and certain of the elders of the people, to salute him peaceably, and to show him the burnt sacrifice that was offered for the king," as formerly for the Persian kings, Ezra vi. 10, and afterwards, according to the accounts of Philo and Josephus, for the Emperors Augustus and Tiberius. But Nicanor, enraged at his disappointment, "abused them shamefully," namely, he defiled their ears with blasphemous words, and demanded, with threats of vengeance in case of refusal, that Judas and his army should be delivered up to him. The priests could only retire to the Temple, where before the altar they made a solemn appeal to Heaven in the deepest distress, saying, "Thou, O Lord, didst choose this house to be called by thy name, and to be a house of prayer and petition for thy people: Be avenged of this man and his host, and let them fall by the sword; remember their blasphemies, and suffer them not to continue any longer." The priests were soon afterwards gratified by the accomplishment of their wishes. Nicanor left Jerusalem, and encamped in Beth-horon, where he met the Syrian troops. Judas appeared at Adasa, about thirty furlongs distant from Jerusalem according to Josephus, with three thousand men, and after imploring the assistance of Jehovah, a battle ensued between him and Nicanor in which the latter was slain, and his army, consisting of two thousand five hundred men, entirely dispersed. Judas cut off the head and right hand of Nicanor, and carried them to Jerusalem as trophies of his victory. This battle was deemed of such importance by the Jews that they annually commemorated it on the thirteenth of the

month Adar, which is equivalent to our March. It is said that this festival is still kept by the Jews under the name of the *day of Nicanor*. It is worthy of notice, that the narration of the Second Book of the Maccabees terminates with this victory; and it may be here observed, that the simple account of the transactions with Nicanor in the First Book is much more probable than the long detail in the Second. The supposed reconciliation of Nicanor with Judas—that “he would not willingly have Judas out of his sight, for he loved the man from his heart,” 2 Macc. xiv. 24—is inconsistent both with his character that he “bare deadly hatred unto Israel,” 1 Macc. vii. 26, and with his subsequent conduct.

After this victory the Jews enjoyed a season of tranquillity, and at this time we find Judas sending an embassy to Rome, soliciting the friendship of that powerful people. Judas had “heard of the fame of the Romans, that they were mighty and valiant men, and such as would lovingly accept all that joined themselves unto them, and make a league of amity with all that came unto them; and that they were men of great valour.” Then follows a detail of the exploits of the Romans as told to Judas, in which the mighty commonwealth is described as it was before the third Punic War. As there are several geographical errors and mis-statements in what is related as communicated to Judas, but which may probably be ascribed to the errors of the transcriber, it is necessary to notice them here. Judas, it appears, was told that the Romans had conquered the Galatians, by whom we are to understand not the Galatians of Asia Minor, to whom St Paul wrote his Epistle, but the Gauls, called Galli by the Romans, the greatest part of whose country is the kingdom of France. He was also informed that they had taken the country of India, and Media, and Lydia, from Antiochus the “Great king of Asia,” and had given them to Eumenes, but instead of India and Media, we ought unquestionably to read *Ionia* and *Mysia*, for no Jew could be ignorant that India

and Media never belonged to the Romans, or to the successors of Eumenes, but we learn from Livy that *Ionia* and *Mysia* were given to that king. Judas was farther told that the Romans had “made for themselves a senate house, wherein three hundred and twenty men sat in council, consulting alway for the people, to the end they might be well ordered;” but it is well known that the number of the Roman senate was not definite, though this may have been the number at the time indicated. He was finally informed that “they committed their government to one man every year, who ruled over all their country, and that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation among them.” It is to be observed, however, that there were two consuls, though the conduct of military affairs was committed to one.

The embassy sent by Judas to Rome consisted of Eupolemus, the son of that John who had obtained from Seleucus Philopator a grant of those privileges for the Jews which Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to abolish, and Jason, the son of Eleazar, who had instructions to entreat the Romans “that they would take the yoke from them, for they saw that the kingdom of the Grecians [namely, of the Syro-Macedonians, or Seleucidæ] did oppress Israel with servitude.” The reply of the Roman senate is given at length by the author of the Maccabees (1 Macc. viii. 23–28). The Romans, who knew how to render alliances with other nations the means of their future subjugation, readily concluded a treaty which could do no injury to themselves and yet be of some advantage to the Jews, sending orders at the same time to Demetrius to make no encroachments on Judea. The copy of this treaty was written on a table of brass, and sent to Jerusalem, it having been the custom of the Romans to inscribe their laws and treaties on brass on account of the hardness of that material. Josephus informs us that this was the first treaty which the Jews made with the Romans—a circumstance extremely probable, when we con-

sider the manner in which the author of the Maccabees introduces it, and that the Jews had at this time very little knowledge of a people who were in less than two centuries afterwards to subjugate them to bondage, destroy their capital, and scatter them throughout the world. Justin observes respecting this transaction of Judas Maccabæus with the Romans—"The Jews, when they revolted from Demetrius, having sought the friendship of the Romans, were the first of the nations of the East who regained their liberty, the Romans at that time easily giving to others that which was not their own."

But it happened that before Demetrius received the letter of the Romans, he had sent a large army to Judea under the command of Bacchides, with orders to reinstate the high priest Alcimus, and reduce the country to obedience. This army on its march subdued the stronghold of Mesaloth in Arbela of Galilee, and encamped near Jerusalem, whence Bacchides marched to Berea with twenty thousand foot and two thousand horse. Judas lay at Eleasa, or Laiza, a place not far from Berea, with only three thousand men. The numbers of the enemy disheartened the Jews, and such a desertion took place that Judas found his little army reduced to eight thousand men. He nevertheless ventured on an attack, and forfeited his life to his imprudent rashness. Thus fell the great Judas Maccabæus, the restorer of the true worship of God, and the reliever and protector of his distressed countrymen. He was buried in the sepulchre of his ancestors at Modin, where the tombs of the Maccabees are still to be seen, by his brothers Jonathan and Simon, deeply regretted and bewailed by the Jews, who "made great lamentation for him, and mourned many days." We are told that "as for the other things concerning Judas and his wars, and the noble acts which he did, and his greatness, they are not written; for they were very many."

Under the protection of the Syrians the apostate Jews now regained the ascendancy, and as they were put by

Bacchides into all the offices of trust in the country their insolence was unrestrained. They took advantage of a severe famine to monopolize all the provisions, and they thus reduced their countrymen to the greatest distress. The adherents of Judas were every where massacred, and the greatest excesses were committed by the Syrians. In this extremity the pious Jews repaired to JONATHAN, surnamed Apphus, the youngest brother of Judas, and chose him for their leader, and the successor to his brother. Jonathan accepted the proffered elevation, and retired with his followers to the Wilderness of Thecoë, properly Tekoa, and encamped near a cistern called Asphar. After a few skirmishes with the nomade Arab tribes in that neighbourhood, Jonathan sent the wives and children, and the most valuable property of his soldiers, to the Nabathæan Arabs, under an escort commanded by his eldest brother Johanan or John, also called Caddis. But on their way they were attacked and plundered by the Arab tribe of Jambri from Medaba, a place in the ancient territory of the Moabites, and John himself was slain. Jonathan and his brother Simon soon afterwards revenged this unprovoked outrage by falling suddenly upon these Arabs while they were engaged in a marriage procession of a daughter of one of their chiefs, and many of them were killed.

Bacchides prepared to attack Jonathan, who, to secure himself more effectually from the Syrian general, withdrew into the marshes formed by the overflowings of the Jordan, where access to him was extremely difficult. But Bacchides followed him, and on the Sabbath day made an attack on the pass leading to Jonathan's camp, which he carried by storm, though he lost a thousand men. The Jews defended themselves with great bravery, but they were overpowered by numbers, and were compelled to save themselves by swimming to the other side of the Jordan, whither their enemies did not follow them. Bacchides returned to Jerusalem, and repaired the fortifications on

Mount Zion, as he did also in other places, providing them with garrisons to hold the country in subjection. Alcimus was now established in the high priesthood, but he soon afterwards, B.C. 159, died suddenly in great agony. Bacchides immediately withdrew from the country, and the Jews enjoyed peace for two years. It is likely that Demetrius had by this time received the letters sent by the Romans in behalf of the Jews, and this explains the reason that he undertook nothing farther against Judas, for he was then making every effort to gain the favour of the Romans, that he might be confirmed by them in the possession of the Syrian throne.

The apostate Jews became tired of the tranquillity enjoyed by their nation, and in the year B.C. 158, they invited Bacchides to assist them in their restless projects by attacking Jonathan and his party. The Syrian general readily listened to their requests, and marched into Judea with an army. Jonathan discovered a plot formed to seize his person, and put to death fifty of the principal conspirators, which deterred the rest from prosecuting their design; but as he was unable to contend with the numerous force of Bacchides, he retired to Beth-basi—a place strongly situated in the Desert. Its fortifications had fallen into decay, but he repaired these so thoroughly that Bacchides was unable to subdue it, and his army was constantly annoyed by sallies from the besiegers under the command of Simon, and by the foraging parties of Jonathan. The Syrian general at last raised the siege, and in his rage he put to death those who had persuaded him to embark in this ruinous campaign. A peace was afterwards concluded between him and Jonathan, which both parties swore to observe, and the prisoners taken in the war were released.

The throne of Syria was about this time disputed by Alexander Balas, who determined to expel Demetrius Soter. Both were anxious to secure the friendship of Jonathan Maccabæus, who was able to render essential service to the

party whose cause he espoused. Demetrius offered to make him commander-in-chief in Judea, and to release the Jewish hostages detained in the citadel of Jerusalem. The garrison delivered up these hostages, and all the Syrian soldiers in the fortresses were withdrawn, except those of Bethsura and Jerusalem, who, being composed chiefly of apostate Jews, were afraid to leave those places of refuge. The power of Jonathan was now greatly increased; he repaired the walls and fortifications of Jerusalem, and assumed the state of an independent leader.

Alexander Balas attempted to excel Demetrius in the liberality of his offers, and addressed to Jonathan a letter in the most flattering and complimentary terms, calling him his brother, giving him the title of friend and rank of king, appointing him to the high priesthood, and sending him a golden crown. Jonathan accepted these honours, without openly espousing either party, and became the high priest of the Jews, an office which continued in his family till the days of Herod. As soon as Demetrius heard of the offers of his rival, he resolved to undo him if possible in generosity, and sent the following letter to Jonathan, which is preserved by Josephus, and also, with some little variations, by the author of the *First Book of the Maccabees*:—"King Demetrius to Jonathan, and to the nation of the Jews, sendeth greeting—Since you have preserved your friendship for us, and when you have been tempted by our enemies you have not joined yourselves to them, I both commend you for this your fidelity, and exhort you to continue in the same disposition, for which you shall be repaid, and receive rewards from us. For I will free you from the greatest part of the tributes and taxes which you formerly paid to the kings my predecessors, and to myself, and I do now set you free from those tributes which you have ever paid. I forgive you the tax upon salt, and the value of the crowns which you used to offer me; and instead of the third part of the fruits of the field, and the half of the fruits of the trees, I

relinquish my part of them from this day. As to the poll-money, which ought to be given me for every head of the inhabitants of Judea, and of the three toparchies that adjoin Judea [Samaria, Galilee, and Perea], that I relinquish to you for this time, and for all time to come. I will also that the city of Jerusalem be holy and inviolable, and free from the tithe and from the taxes, to its utmost bounds; and I so far recede from my title to the citadel as to permit Jonathan your high priest to possess it, that he may place such a garrison in it as he approves of for fidelity and good will to himself, that they may keep it for us. I also make free all those Jews who have been made slaves and captives in my kingdom. I give orders that the beasts of the Jews be not pressed for our service, and let their Sabbaths, and all their festivals, and three days before each of them, be free from any imposition. In the same manner I set free the Jews who are inhabitants of my kingdom, and order that no injury be done unto them. I also give leave to such of them as are willing to enlist themselves in my army that they may do it, and those as far as 30,000, which Jewish soldiers, wheresoever they go, shall have the same pay as my own army hath, and some of them I will place in my garrisons, and some as guards about mine own body, and as rulers over those that are in my court. I give them leave also to use the laws of their forefathers, and to observe them, and I will that they have power over the three toparchies that are added to Judea; and it shall be in the power of the high priest to take care that no one Jew shall have any other temple for worship but only that at Jerusalem. I bequeath also, out of my own revenues yearly, for the expenses about the sacrifices, 150,000 drachmæ, and what money is to spare I will that it shall be your own. I also release to you those 10,000 drachmæ which the kings received from the Temple, because they appertain to the priests that minister in that Temple. And whosoever shall fly to the Temple of Jeru-

salem, and to the places thereto belonging, or who owe the king money, or are there on any other account, let them be set free, and let their goods be in safety. I also give you leave to repair and rebuild your Temple, and that all be done at my expense. I also allow you to build the walls of your city, and to erect high towers, and that they be erected at my charge. And if there be any fortified town which would be convenient for the Jews to have very strong, let it be so built at my expense."

These extravagant promises were received with suspicion and distrust by the Jews—"they gave no credit unto them, nor received them, because they remembered the great evil that he had done in Israel, for he had afflicted them very sore; but with Alexander [Balas] they were well pleased, because he was the first that entreated of true peace with them, and they were confederate with him always." Although at first unsuccessful, Alexander Balas at length ascended the throne of Syria, and proceeded to Ptolemais to marry Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy Philometer. Thither Jonathan repaired, and was received by the two kings with marked distinction. The complaints which the dissatisfied Jews preferred against him were dismissed without a hearing, and Balas raised him to the highest honours.

When Demetrius, the eldest son of Demetrius Soter, appeared to challenge the right of Alexander Balas to the crown of Syria, Jonathan continued faithful to the latter. He advanced with ten thousand men against Apollonius, the governor of Cælo-Syria, who had espoused the cause of Demetrius, and who had challenged the Jewish leader to meet him in arms. Jonathan took possession of Ashdod, conquered Apollonius in a pitched battle, and afterwards laid that city and several others in ruins. Ashkelon opened its gates to him, and he returned to Jerusalem in triumph. Alexander Balas acknowledged his services in a suitable manner, and gave him possession of Ekron.

The various transactions which followed are noticed in other parts of the present work, and are very minutely detailed by Josephus in the Thirteenth Book of his Antiquities, and by the author of the Book of the Maccabees. Tryphon, also called Diodotus, who in conjunction with Hierax had formerly administered the affairs of the government at Antioch under Alexander Balas, repaired to the Arabian emir Zabdiel, to whom Balas had entrusted the care of his son Antiochus, and succeeded in obtaining possession of the young prince, whom he conducted to Syria, B C. 144, with the intention of placing him on his father's throne, to the exclusion of Demetrius Nicator. Jonathan, who had sufficient reason to be dissatisfied with the latter, accepted the honours conferred upon him by Antiochus, who had ascended the throne with the surname of *Theos*, or *the god*. He successfully opposed the troops of the defeated Demetrius, and his enterprises were ably seconded by his brother Simon, whom Antiochus Theos had constituted commander of all the royal forces from the mountains near Tyre to the frontiers of Egypt. Jonathan returned in triumph to Jerusalem, and sent ambassadors to Rome, who were received with honour by the senate, and dismissed with assurances of friendship. Demetrius again appeared in the field after the defeat he had sustained in Galilee, and ventured on another campaign against the Jews. Jonathan marched as far as Hamath, on the extreme frontiers of the ancient Canaan, to meet his enemies, where he was informed by his spies that they intended to attack him during the night. This enabled him to make such preparations for their reception as induced them not only to relinquish their purpose, but to retreat hastily, followed by Jonathan, who, however, was unable to overtake them. He gained some successes against the adherents of Demetrius in his return, and when he arrived at Jerusalem he began to provide for future exigencies by repairing the fortifications, while Simon was sent to strengthen and garrison several

towns in the country. These transactions were not, as it soon appeared, unnecessary. Tryphon, who had elevated Antiochus Theos to the throne of Syria for the sole purpose of murdering him and usurping his authority, was deterred from the execution of his design by his dread of the power of Jonathan. Determined to secure the Jewish leader if possible, he marched into Palestine with an army, and advanced as far as Bethshan. Jonathan met him at the head of forty thousand men, which induced Tryphon to protest that his intentions were friendly, and that his object was to put him in possession of Ptolemais. He expostulated with Jonathan on his unnecessary alarm, and asked him—"Why hast thou put all this people to so great trouble, seeing there is no war betwixt us? Therefore send them now home again, and choose a few men to wait on thee, and come thou with me to Ptolemais, for I will give it thee, and the rest of the strongholds and forces, and all that have any charge; as for me, I will return and depart; for this is the cause of my coming." He was successful in deceiving Jonathan, who dismissed his whole army except three thousand men, two thousand of whom he left in Galilee, and advanced with one thousand to take possession of Ptolemais. But the Jewish leader no sooner entered the city than the gates were shut, his men put to the sword, and himself put in chains. The two thousand Jews left in Galilee were ordered to be destroyed by Tryphon, but the division of his army sent against them found them so determined to sell their lives dearly, that it was not deemed expedient to attack them.

The Jews heard of the fate of Jonathan with the utmost consternation, and his brother Simon, who had already distinguished himself in various military enterprises, called an assembly in the Temple, encouraged them to a vigorous resistance, and offered to become their leader, which was joyfully accepted. The Jews now appeared in such strength that Tryphon was afraid to hazard a battle. He gave

out to Simon that his brother was detained on account of one hundred talents of tribute which remained due, and that if the money were paid, and two sons of Jonathan consigned to him as hostages, their father would be set at liberty. Simon knew that this was a mere artifice, yet, that it might not be said that he neglected any means to procure the release of his brother, he sent the money and the two sons of Jonathan. Tryphon received the money and the hostages, but he still detained the Jewish leader, and proceeded to ravage the country. He ordered some troops to relieve the garrison of Jerusalem, who were suffering much from their long continued blockade, and who had implored him to assist them. A heavy fall of snow, however, prevented the march of his troops, and forced him to retire to winter-quarters in Gilead. When he arrived near Bascama he ordered Jonathan to be put to death, and soon afterwards, B.C. 143, he privately murdered Antiochus Theos, giving out that he had died in the hands of a physician, and proclaimed himself king of Syria. He then retired from Palestine, no one believing his representations. Simon took the body of his brother Jonathan from Bascama, and conveyed it to the paternal sepulchre at Modin, where it was interred, and a magnificent monument of hewn stone erected, which Eusebius informs us was standing in his time, two centuries after Josephus, who describes it as entire in his day, and observes that the fabric was esteemed a curious and excellent piece of architecture. "Moreover," says the author of the Maccabees, "he set up seven pyramids, one against another, for his father, and his mother, and his four brethren; and in these he made cunning devices, about the which he set great pillars, and upon the pillars he made all their armour for a perpetual memory, and by the armour ships carved that they might be seen of all that sail on the sea," namely, the Mediterranean.

Simon, now the successor of his brother in the high priesthood and in the command of the army, sent ambassadors

to Rome to inform the senate of the fate of Jonathan, and to renew his alliance with the Romans. The ambassadors were received with great honour, and renewed their friendship on their return with other allies of the Jews. Demetrius, who required the aid of the Jewish nation against the usurping regicide Tryphon, acknowledged Simon as their high priest and prince, relinquished all claims against them for customs or tribute, and consented to bury in oblivion all previous quarrels and offences. He confirmed these concessions by a royal edict, and the Jews once more became an independent people, B.C. 143—an era commemorated on the coins of Simon, and duly noticed by their own historians.

Simon now exerted himself to improve the condition of his country. He formed a harbour at Joppa, conquered Gazara, compelled the garrison on Mount Zion to surrender, repaired the military works, strengthened the fortifications of the hill on which the Temple stood, and built a strong residence for himself called Baris, near the Temple. He also appointed his son John Hyrcanus to the command of his army. The Jews enjoyed a season of quiet under Simon, and the author of the Maccabees pronounces a fine eulogium on his government and proceedings:—"As for the land of Judea, that was quiet all the days of Simon, for he sought the good of his nation in such wise that evermore his authority and honour pleased them well.—Then did they till their ground in peace, and the earth gave her increase, and the trees of the field their fruit. The ancient men sat in the streets, communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He provided victuals for the cities, and set in them all manner of munition, so that his honourable name was renowned to the end of the world. He made peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy; for every man sat under his own vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to fray them, neither was there any left in the land to fight against them; yea, the

kings themselves were overthrown in those days. Moreover, he strengthened all those of his people that were brought low; the Law he searched out, and every contemner of the Law and wicked person he took away. He beautified the sanctuary, and multiplied the vessels of the Temple." Two years after the accession of Simon, an assembly was held at Jerusalem, when the Jews gratefully acknowledged the services of Simon by making the high priesthood and government hereditary in his family. This decree was engraved on plates of copper, and fixed to a monument which was erected in the Temple.

In the year B. C. 140, Antiochus Sidetes assumed the title of king of Syria, and having married Cleopatra, he joined her forces to his own, and took the field against Tryphon the usurper. He wrote to Simon assuring him of his friendship, permitting him to coin money "with his own stamp," and granting him all the advantages of an independent sovereign. Tryphon was defeated, and Antiochus Sidetes became master of the whole Syrian empire, of which he held possession nine years. When he arrived in Syria and saw the strength of his party, he paid no regard to his promises to Simon, and rejected the two thousand auxiliaries, the arms, the gold and silver, and the military engines which the Jewish ruler sent to aid him in the siege of Dora near Mount Carmel. He sent one of his friends named Athenobius to Jerusalem to demand possession of Gazara, Joppa, the castle on Mount Zion, and several other fortified places, or, instead thereof, the payment of five hundred talents, and the same sum in addition as a compensation for the damage which he alleged had been done by the Jews to the Syrian empire. When Athenobius arrived at Jerusalem, and saw the "glory of Simon, and the cupboard of gold and silver plate, and his great attendance, he was astonished." He delivered the message of Antiochus to Simon, who offered to pay one hundred talents for the possession of Gazara and Joppa, but the other places he

claimed as the hereditary inheritance of the Jews, which, having been wrongfully seized and retained, were now restored to their lawful owners. This answer greatly irritated Antiochus, and he sent an army into the neighbourhood of Joppa and Jamnia under the command of Cendebeus, who fortified Gedor, improperly called Cedron in the First Book of the Maccabees, and made hostile incursions into the Jewish territories. Simon was too far advanced in years to endure the fatigues of a campaign, and he sent out a force consisting of twenty-one thousand foot with some horse, under the command of his sons John Hyrcanus and Judas. They defeated Cendebeus, and compelled him to shut himself up in Gedor. Judas was wounded in the battle, but John Hyrcanus pursued the fugitives and burnt the tower of Ashdod, into which a number of them had taken refuge. By these energetic measures the Syrians were soon expelled from the Jewish territories, and as Antiochus was constantly occupied in suppressing the adherents of Tryphon, the Jews enjoyed for a short time a season of tranquillity.

During this interval of peace, Simon occupied himself in making a tour through Judea, for the purpose of examining the country and improving its condition. In the beginning of the year B.C. 135, he came to Jericho, of which his son-in-law Ptolemy, the son of Abubus, was governor. This wretched traitor invited Simon to his fortified residence, and, as he had projected the usurpation of the government, he basely murdered him with his two sons Judas and Mattathias. Thus fell the venerable Simon, after administering the affairs of Judea in a most prosperous manner eight years. Ptolemy sent intelligence of the death of Simon to Antiochus Sidetes, with whom he had probably a secret understanding in the perpetration of this atrocious murder. He also sent some hired assassins to put to death John Hyrcanus; but that prince received timely notice of his danger, and hastened to Jerusalem, where he was universally acknowledged the

of his father Simon in the high priesthood and principality of the Jewish nation, which continued in his family till the time of Herod the Great. Ptolemy, disappointed in his designs, fled to Zeno Cotylais, tyrant of Philadelphia, and his name occurs no more in history.

The author of the First Book of the Maccabees informs us that "as concerning the rest of the acts of John, and his wars and worthy deeds which he did, and the building of the walls which he made, and his doings, behold, these are written in the Chronicles of his priesthood, from the time he was made high priest after his father." This refers to what is called in some of the Greek copies the Fourth Book of the Maccabees, which Josephus follows and abridges in his Antiquities of the Jews, and to that well known author the reader is referred. A copy of this chronicle was at one time extant at Lyons, where it is supposed it was lost by fire. Respecting the two Books of the Maccabees admitted into the catalogue of the Apocryphal writings, the First is an excellent history, and approaches nearest to the style and manner of the sacred historians of any extant. It is supposed to have been written by John Hyrcanus, who, we have seen, began his government at the time when the work concludes. It was originally composed in what is called the Jerusalem dialect of the Chaldee, in which language it was extant in the time of Jerome, who assures us that he had seen it. The Second Book of the Maccabees does not in any way equal the accuracy and excellency of the First Book.

MALACHI, the last of the Twelve Minor Prophets, with whom the canon of the Old Testament closes, is so little known, that it is doubted whether his name is a proper one, or only generic, signifying *the angel of the Lord, a prophet, or a messenger*. The ancient Hebrews considered Ezra to be the real Malachi, which is maintained by the Chaldee Paraphrast and Jerome. The author of the Lives of the Prophets, on

the other hand, assures us that Malachi was of the tribe of Zebulun, and that he was a native of Sapha, where he died when he was very young. It is conjectured that he prophesied under Nehemiah, and after Haggai and Zechariah. Malachi lived about four hundred years before our Saviour's advent, and prophesied of the appearance of John the Baptist, and the twofold coming of Christ. The Jews have an extraordinary tradition that Malachi presided in a council along with Daniel, Haggai, and Zechariah, in which Ezra was secretary, to determine their canon of Scripture. This story requires no refutation.

MANASSEH, the first-born son of Joseph, and the ancestor of the tribe of Manasseh, was a common name among the Jews. The most prominent person so called was the son and successor of the good King Hezekiah, who for a series of years after his accession cancelled all the beneficial effects which his father had produced, by upholding idolatry, erecting idolatrous altars even in the Temple, setting up an image which was worshipped with obscene rites, maintaining a horde of necromancers, astrologers, and soothsayers, and by sacrificing one of his sons to Moloch. His impieties exceeded those of any of his predecessors. He was defeated in battle by the general of Esar-haddon, or Sardocheus, overtaken in his flight, and led captive to Babylon in a most ignominious manner, bound with two chains. During his imprisonment he reflected on the threatenings of the Prophets, repented of his wickedness, and Jehovah permitted him to be restored to his kingdom, though he remained tributary to the Assyrian monarch. After his restoration he earnestly sought to repair the injuries he had occasioned, abolished idolatry, and endeavoured to restore his weakened kingdom to a better state. Manasseh reigned fifty-five years, and was succeeded by his son Amon.

MANOAH, or MANUEH, of the tribe of Dan, was the father of Samson. See SAMSON.

MARK, the Evangelist, believed to be the same person called John Mark, son of Mary. He is called (Col. iv. 10) "sister's son to Barnabas," but the word *ἀνδρὸς*, so translated, signifies cousin rather than nephew. It is thought that he was not one of the personal followers or disciples of our Saviour, having been probably too young at the time; but from the body of Christians assembling in his mother's house, at the time of the martyrdom of St James, and the imprisonment of St Peter, fourteen or fifteen years after the ascension of Christ, he was certainly a member of the church of Jerusalem. We may conclude also that, with Barnabas, he was of the island of Cyprus, and of the tribe of Levi. John was of course his Hebrew name, and the Latin surname Marcus, or Mark, given him after he lived and had laboured among the Gentiles. From the circumstance of St Peter calling him "his son," it is conjectured that he was a disciple or convert of that Apostle. We first find him labouring actively in the work of evangelizing along with St Paul and Barnabas at Antioch. He accompanied them back to Jerusalem, and returned along with them to the capital of Syria. When these two early and warm friends were consecrated to a mission from Antioch among the Gentiles, they took Mark as their minister, and he accompanied them to Cyprus and several of the neighbouring islands, and travelled with them to Perga in Asia. Here, however, he seems to have taken fright at the dangers before them, and returned to Jerusalem, to the great displeasure of St Paul. Eight or ten years after this we find Mark again at Antioch, and not fully restored to the confidence of St Paul. He and Barnabas proposed to visit the Asiatic churches, and the latter determined to take Mark in their company, but St Paul so highly disapproved of the former selfish timidity of their professed assistant, that after a sharp dispute about the propriety of taking such an minister, these two friendly fellow-labourers parted company, and devoted their zeal to the culti-

vation of separate fields. He went with Barnabas to the island of Cyprus, and probably assisted him in the work of the gospel there for some years.

We have no authentic account of his farther labours or proceedings, but we learn from St Paul himself that he was afterwards reconciled to Mark. We find them together at Rome during St Paul's first imprisonment, where, in the salutations of the Epistle to Philemon, he calls him his "fellow-labourer," and during his second imprisonment, and near the close of his labours, he requests Timothy to come to Rome, and bring Mark along with him, because he would be "profitable to him in the ministry." From his early intercourse with St Peter, as well as with all the other apostles at Jerusalem, and his frequent journeys and labours with St Paul and Barnabas, he had ample means of becoming acquainted with the history of the gospel, as well as with the facts of our Lord's life. That he also laboured with St Peter we learn from the salutations sent to those whom he addresses. In the end of the First Epistle he styles him "Marcus, my son." That Epistle is dated from "Babylon," by which it is now generally supposed the Apostle meant Rome, the capital of the existing and persecuting power. From allusions in both of these Epistles to those of St Paul, and from no mention being made of that Apostle, it has been concluded that he had already suffered martyrdom. If this is the case, we conclude that Mark, at the request of Paul, came with Timothy to Rome, and after his death attached himself to Peter.

In the Roman Martyrologies, and in the *Acta Sanctorum*, it is stated that St Mark came to Rome with St Peter in the second year of Claudius, or about the time of the martyrdom of James under Herod Agrippa; but it is undeniable that he was then in the company of Barnabas and Paul. Far more improbable is it that he preached the gospel in Egypt, Libya, and Cyrene, during the reign of Tiberius, as these chronicles also state. He that feared, years after this, to travel

with St Paul and Barnabas in the more peaceful country of Asia Minor, was not likely to encounter alone the dangers of a mission to the barbarous country of Africa. These statements, indeed, profess to be taken from the ancient ecclesiastical historians; but it is only necessary to compare their accounts to show the impossibility of reconciling them with truth. Nicephorus says that Mark came into Egypt in the reign of Tiberius, and Dorotheus makes him suffer in the time of Trajan. The first of these emperors died A.D. 37, and the other did not succeed to the throne of the Cæsars till 98; so that, according to these accounts, Mark's labours must have extended over a period of nearly seventy years. While he was at Rome, he is stated to have written his Gospel at the request of the Christian converts of that city, but at what time it must be evident it is very difficult to decide; but we cannot think it could be earlier than towards the close of Nero's reign, or about A.D. 66 or 67. He was one of those apostolical men who received the gifts of the Holy Spirit from the hands of the Apostles; and there is no ground for supposing, as some of the ancient Fathers did, that he wrote from the dictation of St Peter, or that the approval and sanction of that Apostle were necessary to obtain canonical authority for what he wrote. He is said to imitate or resemble St Peter in the condensed brevity of his style, and in the account of the circumstance of that Apostle's denial of his Master to be more particular, and to give it in a more humiliating manner than any other but the penitent himself would have done. It may be easily supposed that he received this account, as well as much of the history furnished, from St Peter himself, though he did not write the whole under his eye. It has also been supposed by some distinguished Popish writers, as Bellarmine and Baronius, that St Mark wrote his Gospel first in the Latin tongue; but this is asserted in contradiction to the whole voice of antiquity. There are Latinisms in the style of this Gospel, but not more than a Jew, writing

in Greek for the Roman converts who understood that language, would naturally use. It is now also generally acknowledged, that though he wrote after St Matthew, and relates many of the miracles and doctrines recorded by that Apostle, yet he does neither copy nor abridge his account. We cannot afford space to give the proofs of these statements, but refer the reader to the fourth volume of Horne's Introduction and to Michaelis, by whom the question is satisfactorily settled. The time of writing it is equally uncertain, Irenæus stating that it was after the death of St Peter and St Paul, while others maintain that it was written before their martyrdom.

The ecclesiastical writers already cited agree in stating that St Mark preached the gospel, established churches, and made numerous converts in Egypt, and along the north coast of Africa as far as Cyrenaica. If he came to Rome with St Peter early in the reign of Nero, he may have been sent by him upon this mission, and returned before his death. Eusebius and Jerome believe that the hermitical Therapeutæ of the neighbourhood of the Mareotic lake were Christians converted by St Mark, and living according to the strict ascetic rules drawn up by him. But Dr Cave shows satisfactorily that the monastic life was an innovation of a later age than that of the Apostles, and that those hermits, of whom Philo the Jew gives such a laudatory account, were not Christians, but probably a colony of the Jewish sect of the Essenes, or people of similar principles.

It is certain that many apocryphal accounts are given of this Evangelist's labours in Egypt, one of which, taken from the *Acta Sanctorum*, will be sufficient as a specimen. It is there said that St Mark, on his first visit to Alexandria, had walked far, and on entering the city the strap of one of his sandals gave way, which he took as an omen that this was the end of his journey, and that here he was to stop. Looking about he saw a tradesman's shop, and entered for the purpose of getting the damage repaired. In doing this, the

workman, whose name was Anian, severely wounded his hand, and exclaimed that he was ruined, being disabled for work, and began to call upon Serapis to aid him. St Mark interrupted him by informing him of Jesus of Nazareth, in whose name he instantly healed the wound. He afterwards instructed this person in the truths of Christianity, and constituted him Bishop of Alexandria at his death. But we think none of our readers will give credit to such "old wives' fables," or that Anianus, whom Eusebius characterises as a "man beloved of God, and wonderful in all things," and who, he says, ruled in that episcopal throne twenty-two years, was of such an origin, and brought to the knowledge of the truth in such a manner.

It is told us by Metaphrastes, that after labouring in various parts of Africa, St Mark returned to Alexandria, and devoted himself with such zeal to the work of converting the idolatrous Egyptians, that he incurred the bitter resentment of the priests. The great annual solemnity of their god Serapis happened at the same time with the Christian festival of Easter, and the profane multitude, incited to rage by the priests, broke into the place where the Evangelist was engaged in the celebration of divine worship, seized him, bound his feet with cords, and dragged him through the city to a craggy place on the shore, which he calls Bucealus. After tearing and mangling his body in the most barbarous manner, they thrust him into a dungeon for the night. Here his soul was comforted and encouraged by a divine vision of his Master. Next day the persecutors completed their work by again dragging him through the streets, till the flesh was torn from his bones, and the martyr expired in their hands. They afterwards burned his mangled remains, which the Christians collected and buried near the place where he stately preached. Many an age afterwards the Romanists pretend that a company of the Venetian traders being driven thither by stormy weather, in the time of the Saracen power, had the place

of his repose miraculously pointed out, and carried his bones with great pomp to Venice, where, in the gorgeous cathedral dedicated to St Mark, they have since performed multitudes of miracles. Among the great variety of dates given, Dr Cave thinks it most probable that he suffered martyrdom about the end of Nero's reign. There is said to be an autograph copy of his Gospel, or part of it at least, preserved in the Archives of St Mark's at Venice, but so obliterated as not to be now legible. -

MARTHA and MARY were the sisters of Lazarus, whom our Saviour raised from the dead. Martha is always mentioned first by the Evangelical writers, to intimate that she was the elder sister. The incidents connected with them recorded in the Gospels are well known. The ancient Latins and the modern Greeks assert that Martha, Mary, and Lazarus, died at Jerusalem, and were buried there.

MARY, the Virgin-mother of JESUS CHRIST. She was the daughter of Heli, descended of the royal line of David through Nathan, as Joseph was of the same race by descent from Solomon. Heli, it would seem, had no sons, and according to the Jewish custom adopted Joseph, his son-in-law, as his heir. Thus were the two surviving branches of the regal family of the victorious Deliverer of Israel united after thirty generations, and the hopes of the chosen people of God ought to have been directed confidently to the appearance of the predicted mightier Son, and more glorious Deliverer. There is not the shadow of a foundation in the Scriptures for the Romish superstitious belief that Mary had vowed perpetual virginity. Like all the other daughters of Israel, and especially those of the tribe of Judah, and more particularly of the family of David, the strongest desire of her heart must have been, and was, to be the honoured mother of that promised child who was to restore the fallen glory of Jacob, and sit upon the throne of David. We have no account in Scripture of the age

of the Virgin or of Joseph at the time when they are first mentioned. All the old ecclesiastical historians agree that Joseph was old, many that he was a widower, and father of a family, and that Mary was young—considerably under twenty years. According to the almost universal Jewish custom, these humble heirs of decayed royalty were betrothed or espoused, but the marriage was not completed. The paternal hills and valleys of Judah which had of old belonged to the wealthy Jesse, as well as the sceptre of royal power, had long departed from the family. Joseph was a carpenter of Nazareth, apparently without much, if any property, and Mary does not seem to have been more wealthy. Both, however, were believers in the religion of their fathers, and looked with anxious confidence to the fulfilment of the promises of consolation and deliverance. It is probable that Mary had heard of the angelic visit to Zacharias, and the promise of a miraculous child to her aged relative Elisabeth. She knew the Scriptures, and though she might not understand what was the meaning of the prophecy, "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son," yet no doubt she pondered this as well as the other many prophecies in which she, as a descendant of David, must have known that she had a deep interest. From the sacred narrative of Luke we know that she was of a contemplative turn of mind—one who revolved habitually with herself the high prophetic destiny of the family to which she belonged, of which she and her betrothed husband were now the nearest legal representatives. As a thoughtful daughter of Israel who, we know, was well acquainted with all that God had done in days of old to his people—with all that He had revealed and promised still to do, she must have understood that the "acceptable year of the Lord" was drawing near.

In some such of her lonely musings the same angel, or messenger, who had six months before appeared to Zacharias, also came to announce to her the purpose

of God. Such an "all hail" from one of the brightest of the heavenly host threw her into perplexity, till he more explicitly declared the meaning and design of his message—that she should bear a son who should be called the Son of the Highest, and that God would give unto him the throne of his father David. To remove her remaining doubts and strengthen her faith, he told her how she, a virgin, should fulfil the prophecy delivered nearly eight hundred years before; and to confirm her confidence that with God nothing was impossible, he told her that the aged and barren Elisabeth had also miraculously conceived. She took this as an intimation of a supernatural interposition, which she was invited to witness with her own eyes, and after the departure of Gabriel she hastily went to Judea, to the city of Zacharias, supposed to be Hebron, which was about one hundred miles distant from Nazareth. The aged matron received this visit as an honour too high for her, and broke out into inspired rapture upon the unequalled bliss that was conferred upon Mary, whom she declared blessed among women, the mother of her Lord. Mary also was filled with the spirit of prophecy and of heavenly joy, blessing God who had looked upon her low estate, and had exalted her to an honour and dignity far above that of the thrones and principedoms of this world. She glances thence to the fulfilment of the promises given of old to the fathers, and professes her confidence in the faithfulness of God to fulfil all that he had predicted to grant help and deliverance to his people. She spoke as she was moved by the Spirit, but both she and all who heard her were very ignorant of the manner in which those prophecies were to be fulfilled, and that deliverance accomplished. We know not what were her own thoughts and hopes, but most probably she looked forward to royal honours, and temporal victory and deliverance, when the boughs from the stem of Jesse would again flourish in majesty, and the banner of David would again float in triumph from

the hill of Zion, when those now of such low degree would be exalted to sit in those sacred thrones, from which the mighty and proud usurpers would be thrust down.

After staying three months with her cousin Elisabeth, and witnessing the birth of him who was to prepare the way of her own more wonderful son, she returned to Nazareth. She was indeed destined to higher honour and blessing among men than ever daughter of Eve enjoyed, but that honour was mingled with much sorrow and disappointment. Joseph seeing the condition in which his chosen spouse, upon whom he had rested all his hopes of happiness and the honour of his family, resolved privately to break off a union from which he thought that nothing but dishonour and misery could come. He would not indeed expose her to the terrible punishment which the law decreed, in cases such as he suspected, but he determined to have no connexion with one whom he looked upon as an adulteress. While he revolved these bitter thoughts, the angel of God appeared to him, told him of the chaste virginity of Mary, and of the character and undertaking of Him who was to be so miraculously a heaven-born son. Joseph complied with the divine command, and united himself to the Virgin, thus becoming, in the eye of the law, the father of Him who was the Eternal Son of the Lord of heaven and earth.

But Joseph and Mary lived at Nazareth, and the promised King of the Jews behaved to be born at Bethlehem of Judah, the town of his father David. We need not mention the imperial decree which compelled the humble carpenter, who seems to have had no thoughts of doing any thing to accomplish prophecies, which most probably he could not comprehend, to resort thither and enrol his name in those books, which proved that a foreign sovereign ruled over the kingdom of his fathers. Thither he went with Mary, who was in such a condition that the sympathies of common humanity would have granted her an exemption

from that toilsome journey. They came in sore travel to the home and city of their fathers, but there they had no foot of ground which they could call their own, no place of rest in which to find shelter. Bethlehem, the *house of bread*, was to them inhospitable and homeless. The public inn was crowded with strangers who had been brought thither by the same cause as themselves, and she who gave birth to Him who came to redeem the world, had no home but a stable, and no better place in which to lay her first-born—the First-born of all creation—than a manger. The Fathers, indeed, inform us that Mary and her holy child were exempted from the curse pronounced upon our first mother—that as he was conceived without sin, he was born without pain—that no languishing weakness overtook her. It is only a conjectural gloss at the best, unsupported by any thing said in the sacred narrative, which would rather lead us to conclude that the representative and substitute, in all things, of sinful men, was not exempted in any part of his sufferings on earth from the full meaning of that curse which he came to remove by bearing it to the fullest bitterness. But though friendless and unaided there, she soon received evidence that the eye of heaven was watching over her. The shepherds came to witness and pay their homage to Him, who was announced to them as the Saviour, Christ the Lord, born in the city of David. Mary had much reason for anxious thoughts and fears, but at every turn these were counterbalanced by direct intimations from on high that He who had promised was mindful of the fulfilment. That fulfilment was not to take place in any one form in which she probably wished and hoped; but her faith had been already tried, and she had been taught that the ways of God are not scrutable by men, and learned to “keep all these things in her memory, and ponder them in her heart.”

At the end of forty days, when the legal period of purification for her first-born was expired, she carried Jesus to

the Temple to offer sacrifice for her own preservation, and to redeem her child and consecrate him to God. So poor had the descendants of the long line of Jewish kings become, that their undoubted heir had to be ransomed by the very lowest offering which the law allowed — two turtle doves or young pigeons. Here old Simeon in the spirit of prophecy welcomed Him who was the “head over all things to the church” in his own Temple, declared the great work which he was to accomplish, but in the mysterious language of prediction, told Mary that her child would be a “sign which would be spoken against, and that a sword should pierce her own soul also.” The old prophetess Anna confirmed the same hope of deliverance and redemption.

With such high wrought expectations they returned to Nazareth, arranged their affairs, and came to reside in Bethlehem, under the belief probably that there alone should the predicted son of David be brought up. Here the visit of the Eastern Magi, the consequent alarm of the jealous tyrant Herod, the bloody extermination which he decreed, and the warning of the angel, made them flee, under the cloud of night, from this, which they no doubt thought a stronghold of safety. When that storm was blown over they returned from Egypt, and instead of again residing at Bethlehem, for fear of Archelaus, went to Nazareth, where they lived for some years in safety and obscurity.

But though mean and poor they religiously observed the sacred festivals of the Law of Moses. At the age of twelve they took Jesus along with them to enter him as a disciple of the Law. Here he showed what was the “work of his Father,” to which he already looked forward. Joseph and Mary left Jerusalem for their home, but He devoted himself to converse with the teachers of the Law, the expounders of that religion which he came to perfect. On being made aware of his absence, Joseph and Mary returned, and after three days’ search found

Jesus employed thus in the Temple. They, as well as the learned doctors of Israel, were amazed, and Mary seems to have been both grieved and alarmed. “Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.” He returned with them to Nazareth, and “was subject unto them; but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart,” according to the expressive phrase which Luke frequently uses, and which he seems to have had from the Virgin-mother herself.

This is the last mention we find made of Joseph in the sacred history. The narrative of Luke would lead us to suppose that he lived some years after this, but all the old historians of the church agree that he died before Christ entered upon his public ministry. Whether Joseph had children by the Virgin is a question which we will not pretend to solve. The brethren and sisters of Jesus are mentioned, but it will be seen under their names, that these words do not necessarily or universally, in the language of the Jews, designate those born of the same father and mother. The Romish writers very generally maintain that Mary remained always a virgin. With St Basil we would compromise the dispute by saying “it was necessary that she should remain a virgin till the birth of her first-born,—that a virgin might conceive, and bear a son, but what she was afterwards we will leave undecided as not very essential, one way or other, to the mystery.” Neither are we informed how Jesus supported himself and Mary after the death of the carpenter. From the ignorant and scoffing taunt of his countrymen, “Is not this the carpenter?” and from the necessity of all Jewish parents bringing up their sons to some useful arts, we conclude that in this Christ also set an example of obedience and industry. Justin Martyr mentions that Jesus “while among men employed himself in making harrows and yokes,” so that we may conclude that Mary was supported by the industry of Jesus after the decease of Joseph.

When Christ entered on his public ministry we find that Mary frequently was with him, and was filled with all a mother's anxiety in regard to the nature and result of his labours. We find her at the marriage of Cana, where he performed his first public recorded miracle, but from the tenor of her speech on that occasion we conclude that she knew he was possessed of divine power. It is supposed that when his townsmen of Nazareth so ungratefully and ignorantly rejected him he took Mary along with him, and provided a residence for her in Capernaum. Here, and in the neighbourhood, we find her anxious on his account, and desirous to remonstrate with him, when she seems to have thought that the labours of public teaching which he took upon him were too great, and that the dangers to which he exposed himself were unnecessary.

In the last year of his labours and sufferings on earth, she was certainly one of those women from Galilee who accompanied him, and ministered to his wants. She attended the last passover, went with the multitudes to the hill of Calvary, and stood with the beloved disciple to witness that last scene of triumphant agony. That piercing anguish to a mother's heart was indeed the mysterious fulfilment of all that had been promised her, when the angel hailed her as the most highly favoured among women. How different that mode of advancement to the throne of glory was from all she had wished and fondly cherished we can only conjecture. Her hopes of earthly power and glory, if ever she entertained them, were gone; but when her son—the Son of man—burst the fetters of death, and declared himself the “Son of God with power,” that sorrow which had pierced her heart was turned into unspeakable joy. She had been commended to the affectionate care of the beloved disciple, who thenceforth treated her as a mother. Whether she witnessed the ascension of Jesus into heaven to sit on the throne of his glory as the governor of that world which he

had redeemed, we do not know with certainty, but we may perhaps conclude, from the relation of St Luke in the first chapter of the Acts, that she did. She remained with the disciples and apostles till after the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. If Jesus was near forty years old at his crucifixion, as Macknight proves, Mary must have now felt the infirmities of old age. How long she lived, and how she died, history is silent. From the saying of old Simeon, that “a sword should pierce her soul,” it was inferred by some ancient writers that she suffered martyrdom; but there is sufficient explanation of that mysterious intimation of sorrow without having recourse to such a solution. Some have thought that John took her with him to Ephesus when he went to reside there, but if, as is shown in the life of that Apostle, he resided in Jerusalem till near the time of its predicted destruction, we cannot suppose that Mary was then alive. Before that time she would have been near ninety years of age, and we may conclude that before this she had been received into glory. It is probable that she died in peace at Jerusalem.

In such a life we altogether reject the multitudes of fabulous legends with which a superstitious church disfigure the brief annals of her whom they idolatrously worship as the mother of God, and pray to her to command her Son to grant their requests. The questions as to the immaculate conception, and whether she was tainted with original sin, we leave to those who have already written so many useless volumes on these subjects, and p^rond to show on both sides such a multitude of miracles in proof of the doctrine which they hold. Like the body of Moses, her mortal remains were probably concealed, lest the grovelling devotion of superstition should be led still more abjectly to worship senseless dust and ashes. None can be the hearer and answerer of prayer but the Omnipresent, and he more deeply sympathises with, and more enduringly loves, mankind than any of the glorified saints

who have borne the weaknesses of humanity.

MATTHEW, called also LEVI, the Apostle. He was the son of Alpheus, not the same individual as Cleopas or Alphæus, the father of James the Less, but an inhabitant most probably of Capernaum. Matthew was a publican, or collector of taxes under the Roman government. From his toll or office being situated by the side of the Lake, it has been reasonably conjectured that he collected the tax imposed upon passengers, and those who traded or fished on its waters. In the better days of Roman government, the office of publican or general farmer of the revenue was one of high trust and respectability, filled generally by men of the equestrian order, as we learn from Cicero; but in the days of the reigning monarch Tiberius, those who generally administered the office were rapacious and unprincipled. Naturally enough disliked by those from whom they exacted the public taxes, they frequently revenged themselves by executing their commission to the excess of rigour, which rendered them the more certain objects of hatred and execration. In the common speech of the Jews, we know that publicans and sinners were classed together, as words equivalent. Our Saviour uses the word in the common acceptation, when speaking of the obstinate sinner, whom no warning and reproof can affect, he says, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." It would be easy to fill pages with quotations, showing in what detestation this class was generally held in those days. But among the Jews they were most particularly obnoxious, whether they were foreigners or their own countrymen—more so, in the latter case, because they considered such individuals as base trucklers to a despotic and cruel oppression, and the guilty instruments for riveting the yoke of bondage on the necks of the free children of Abraham. Matthew was certainly a Jew, and held in deep detestation by his countrymen; though, from any thing that appears in

his character, such treatment was altogether unmerited by him. Zaccheus, the only other Jewish publican mentioned in the Gospels, was upright and honourable in his conduct, and merciful in the execution of his duty. So seems the son of Alpheus also to have been, though both were held in abhorrence by the Jews.

Such detestation, merited or unmerited, did not prevent our Saviour, who saw the heart and the motives, from casting on both of these looks of respect and affection. Matthew had in all probability listened to the preaching of both the Baptist and Christ, and it would seem that he was a believer in the divine mission of our Saviour. The heavenly Teacher had resided some time at Capernaum, and on one occasion walking by the side of the lake, and instructing the multitudes who followed him, he passed by the toll-booth where Matthew was sitting, and simply looking upon him, called him to follow him. "The man was rich," says Cave, "had a wealthy and gainful trade, was a wise and prudent person—no fools being put into that office,—and understood, no doubt, what it would cost him to comply with this new employment—that he must exchange wealth for poverty, a custom-house for a prison, gainful masters for a naked and despised Saviour." But that Saviour, who knew his character, and well understood in what low estimate it was held among his countrymen, did not hesitate or fear to make use of one so despised and hated, as he had already called others who were unlettered and rude, for the purpose of making known the wisdom and mercy of God to the learned and the great; and Matthew did not hesitate instantly to leave his occupation, and to devote himself to a master under whom he had every prospect of meeting with equal hatred and persecution, deprived of the protection which he formerly possessed, and exposed to privations and labours which he had never known.

Soon after his call he had the occasion of seeing that his desertion of his odious occupation did not exempt him from the

uncharitable feelings of the Scribes and Pharisees. We learn from Luke, not from Matthew, who, from modesty, does not mention his own hospitality, that the new disciple made a great feast for Jesus in his own house, to which he invited a great company of his friends, and those of his late profession. This, though intended for the instruction of them in the truth, gave high displeasure to the sanctimonious professors of Pharisaic strictness, though we do not learn that they therefore refused to participate of the good things of the late publican's well furnished table. "Why do you eat and drink with publicans and sinners?" say they to the disciples. Jesus, without noticing the sweeping injustice of such a classification and identification, and who knew the good intentions of the host, silenced their censorious cavil by telling them that it was such men whom he came to call to repentance, at the same time justifying upon principle and by familiar examples the consistency of his conduct, and the gross inconsistency of theirs.

After this trait of Matthew's character, and this example of what he was afterwards to meet with among his countrymen, we have no particular notice of him during the future peregrinations of Jesus and his followers. He was appointed with the rest as an apostle to go forth and preach the Gospel, and prepare the way of his Master—he accompanied him throughout, was a hearer of all his instructions, a witness of all the miracles which he wrought, and continued with the rest till the crucifixion and ascension into heaven.

We have no account of his labours after the effusion of the Holy Spirit, but we learn from ancient history that he preached throughout Judea for a number of years, probably till the divine intimation that the Gentiles also were to receive the light of truth and salvation. The doctrines which Christ preached, the miracles which he wrought, and the life which he led, Matthew committed to writing, but at what time or in what language it is now difficult to determine.

Epiphanius informs us that it was written about eight years after Christ's ascension, the first of all the Gospels, and the general ancient belief was that it was composed originally in Hebrew, but afterwards translated by some one of the Apostles or Evangelists into Greek. This copy, as having received Apostolic sanction, and being in the language chiefly spoken after the destruction of Jerusalem, was that which was most carefully preserved, and most frequently transcribed, and added with the other Gospels and writings to the sacred canon; and the Hebrew Gospel falling into the hands of the heretic Nazarenes was corrupted, and in the days of Jerome in the fourth century considered unworthy of the Apostle. The modern explanation is, that Matthew early wrote his Gospel, perhaps first of all in the common language of the country, and between twenty or thirty years afterwards translated it into the Greek to render it the same as the rest, and more useful. Those who wish to study the question will find the elements of it impartially laid down in *Horne's Introduction*, Vol. IV., and multitudes of authorities there referred to. It is obvious that the Gospel was written for the Jews, and with the particular design to prove that in the Messiah whom they expected, and whom the Apostle proved to be Jesus Christ, were fulfilled all their ancient prophecies of deliverance and restoration. He does not keep the exact order of events, but sets himself first to prove that Christ was the Messiah pointed out, in whom all the personal prophecies that related to his genealogy, and place of his birth, and circumstances attending it, were accomplished—then by giving a full account of his doctrines and precepts and mode of teaching, shows that he was the great prophet and teacher of the truth, whom they were authorized to expect,—then gives an account of the many miracles and particular acts of divine power and authority which gave present and visible sanction to such claims, and concludes by showing in what way the great work of that deliverance

was accomplished, declaring the universality of it, applicable not only to the Jews, but to all nations of the Gentile world.

In that Gospel the account which he gives of himself is a proof of his great humility and self-denial. The other Evangelists suppress every thing that might remind him or their readers of the public odium in which his former occupation was held—he details them with minuteness. We do not indeed give any credit to the too monkish-looking story of Clement of Alexandria of the hermitical abstemiousness of his life—that he refused to partake of the ordinary lawful food, much less of the greater delicacies of life, confining himself to vegetables and roots, seeds and berries. We find nothing of this in the great feast which he provided for our Saviour and his friends, and there is nothing in the authentic history of the Apostles, even after the “bridegroom was taken from them,” which leads us to suppose that they did not eat their food with joy and gladness of heart—that they did not make use of the good gifts of God with thankfulness, without, however, riotously abusing them. His self-denial was sufficiently proved in forsaking a lucrative occupation and a sumptuous house for a life of poverty and laborious travel, and certain persecution—for the service of a Master who promised his followers nothing but these in this world. “Indeed,” says Cave, “so admirable was his change in this case, that Porphyry and Julian (two subtle and acute adversaries of the Christian religion) hence took occasion to charge him either with falsehood or folly—either that he gave not a true account of the thing, or that it was very weakly done of him so hastily to follow any one that called him.”

As we know not the time when he left Judea, so we know not the extent of the particular field of labour which fell to his lot. The Church historians, however, who have mentioned his progress afterwards, all agree in stating that it lay to the East. In obedience to the final com-

mand of his Saviour “to go and teach all nations,” he is said to have travelled through the Indian Ethiopia, Persia, Parthia, preaching the Gospel with great success and making numerous converts, overthrowing idolatry and establishing teachers in the churches. These, of course, are the reports of a late age, the writers of which have deformed their accounts with many fabulous and rather childish miracles. We know that from all quarters accounts came of the mighty success of the preaching of the truths of the Gospel, else Paul could not have said that it had been preached “to every creature under heaven,” before he left the field of labour; but the memorials of the particulars were either never committed to writing, or they were lost before days of established peace enabled the writers of Church history to give their time to collect and arrange a regular narrative. It is reported that he finally suffered martyrdom about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, in the Indian Ethiopia, but even this is uncertain, as other writers say he died in peace. We may suppose that he returned to Jerusalem to give an account of his labours, and again went to visit the churches which he had planted and pursue those labours, but of this no memorial worthy of trust has been left.

MATTHIAS, the Apostle, was elected in place of Judas the traitor, soon after the Ascension, when the Apostles and disciples met, apparently for the first time, in a body to deliberate upon what they should do. Peter alluded to the vacancy made in the number of the twelve by the apostacy and desperate suicide of Judas, quoting the prophecy which predicted this treachery, and another which clearly indicated their duty of appointing a successor. From what Peter said we learn the requisites which were necessary to fit any disciple for the Apostolic office—he must be one who had accompanied Jesus during the whole course of his ministry, from the baptism by John till the resurrection and ascension of their Lord. The account given of this

first ecclesiastical proceeding is very interesting, but it is confessedly difficult to ascertain the mode in which they proceeded—if by personal voting, whether the Apostles only, or the whole one hundred and twenty, gave their votes, or whether, as Grotius thinks, it was by a more direct and definite appeal to God to decide. The purport of their prayer to God, “who knoweth the hearts of all men, to show which he had chosen,” would lead us to suppose that it was not by a collecting of the voices of the company, but what other way they followed we do not pretend to decide. They appointed two, Joseph (supposed to be “the brother of Jesus”), called Barsabas and surnamed Justus, and Matthias. They gave their lots, and the lot fell upon the latter, who was thenceforth numbered as one of the Apostles. Grotius thinks that they put into an urn only the names of these two disciples, along with a void lot and the name of another Apostle, and drawing out the name of Joseph and the void lot, they knew that their Master had chosen Matthias. It seems to have been in some such way as this, common throughout the whole history of the Jewish commonwealth, that the Apostles discovered the will of God in the matter. Chrysostom says that they thus decided by lot because the Spirit was not yet given, by whose immediate revelation they were afterwards directed.

That Spirit of wisdom and power was soon after this given in full measure to Matthias as well as the rest. He laboured at first for a number of years in Judea, and it is not certain when he left that country for foreign lands, or where he chiefly laboured. In the Greek *Monologies*, or Calendars of the Saints, he is reported to have travelled first into Asia Minor and afterwards to the East. He preached the Gospel among a race of barbarous and cruel men, but though he was treated inhospitably and persecuted from place to place, he made many converts. Dorotheus says he died and was buried at Sebastopolis. Others report that he was seized by the Jews as a blas-

phemer, stoned, and then beheaded. The more general belief is that he was crucified and his body buried at Jerusalem. Helen, the mother of the first Christian emperor, Constantine, when superstitious veneration for the relics of these holy men had engendered idolatry, transferred to Rome what was said to be some fragments of his bones, where they are kept with as superstitious a veneration till this day. No genuine writings of this Apostle remain, but a spurious Gospel, mentioned and condemned by the ancients, went under his name. The licentious Nicolaitanes are said to have attributed to his authority a saying of theirs—“that we ought to abuse the flesh,” and to have justified themselves in their gross sensualities by his pretended sanction. Clemens of Alexandria says that there was as little foundation for this as for the equally unsupported assertion that the deacon Nicolas was the first teacher of their gross immoralities.

MELCHIZEDEK, king of Salem, and “priest of the most high God,” is mentioned by Moses without any reference to his genealogy, his birth, or his death. When Abraham returned from the pursuit of the confederated kings who had carried off Lot, he was met by Melchizedek, who presented to him bread and wine with his benediction. The Patriarch acknowledged him as a priest of God, and offered him tithes of the spoils he had taken from the enemy. After this time he is not mentioned by the sacred historians, and is only once noticed in the 110th Psalm, where it is said, in allusion to the Messiah, “Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek.” Some of the early Christians assumed that he was a Divine Person, and a sect originated called by his name, who elevated him even above our blessed Saviour. A considerable controversy has existed respecting the identity of Melchizedek, which it is unnecessary to detail in the present work, as all inquiries into the subject end in very unsatisfactory conjectures.

MENAHEN, a king of the Ten Tribes,

succeeded the regicide Shallum, whom he put to death. His reign, which extended to ten years, was most unfortunate. The king of Assyria, whose empire was beginning to emerge from obscurity, made war against him, and as he could not resist this powerful enemy he purchased a peace at the price of one thousand talents, and became tributary to Assyria. He died a natural death, and was succeeded by his son Pekahiah.

MEPHIBOSHETH. See **DAVID**.

MICAH, the seventh in order of the twelve Minor Prophets, is called a Morasthite, from a village near Eleuthropolis in the south of Judah. He was contemporary with Isaiah, and employs some expressions in common with him. Jerome says that he was buried at Morasthais, and Sozomen asserts that his tomb was discovered by a bishop of Eleuthropolis in the reign of Theodosius the Great. Micah prophesied under Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, during a period of about fifty-six years. He received his revelations by visions, and executed his commission against Judah and Israel with great zeal and animation. One of his predictions saved the life of Jeremiah, who would have been put to death in the reign of Jehoiakim for prophesying the destruction of the Temple, if it had not been discovered that Micah had foretold the same fact one hundred years before, in the reign of Hezekiah. Micah predicted the invasions of Shalmanezzer and Sennacherib, and their triumph over Israel; the captivities, dispersion, and deliverance of Israel; the cessation of prophecy; the destruction of Assyria and Babylon, the representatives of the enemies of the Christian Church; the birth of our blessed Saviour at Bethlehem-Ephratah, the establishment and exaltation of Christ's kingdom over all nations, the influence of the gospel, and the destruction of Jerusalem. His style is nervous, concise, and elegant; often elevated and poetical, but sometimes obscure from sudden transitions of the subject. The contrast of the neglected duties of justice, mercy, humility, and piety,

with the punctilious observance of the ceremonial sacrifices affords a beautiful example of the harmony between the Mosaic and the Christian Dispensations. Some have improperly confounded Micah with MICAH, the son of Imlah of Ephraim, who prophesied in the time of Ahab. Several persons of this name are mentioned in the Scriptures, particularly Micah of Mount Ephraim, whose story is related in the Book of Judges.

MICHAL. See **DAVID**.

MIRIAM. See **MOSES**.

MORDECAI. See **ESTHER**.

MOSES, one of the most remarkable persons in Scripture biography, was the son of Amram and Jochebed, both of the tribe of Levi. He was born in the district of Goshen in Egypt in the year B.C. 1571, according to the Hebrew chronology, at a time when the Hebrews were most severely oppressed by one of that new dynasty of Pharaohs who "knew not Joseph," and was either ignorant of or disregarded the distinguished services of the illustrious son of Jacob. The king, perceiving that the Israelites became numerous and powerful notwithstanding his tyranny, promulgated an order that every male child born of Hebrew parents should be cast into the Nile. This decree was in force at the birth of Moses, sixty-four years after the death of Joseph, and was probably enacted soon after the birth of Aaron, which was three years earlier, for we find that he was not subject to the danger. We may, therefore, date it about the thirty-second year of the bondage of the Israelites, and about one hundred and thirty years after their settlement in Goshen.

To what extent this decree was obeyed, if it was obeyed at all, we are nowhere satisfactorily informed. The object of it was obvious. The sovereign of the new dynasty—one of those warlike Shepherd Kings whose race had formerly been driven out of Egypt into Palestine, found himself master of a land in which were two distinct nations—the ancient Mizraim and the pastoral de-

scendants of Jacob in Goshen, who from a sense of mutual benefits had generally lived in strict friendship with each other; and this "new Pharaoh" was fully aware, or at least he very naturally suspected, that notwithstanding any temporary disgust, the Israelites would be far more likely to make common cause with the ancient inhabitants and people of Egypt, than with himself and his intrusive warriors. The warlike Shepherds, moreover, in their second invasion of Egypt, must have passed through the country of Goshen; and it appears, from the subsequent fears of the king himself, that the Israelites were in a condition, by their numbers and strength, to have offered a most powerful resistance to the invasion if they had been so inclined. The principle of the policy adopted by Pharaoh against the Hebrews is most distinctly exposed by Moses. The pastoral tyrant hoped by degrees to extirpate the whole Israelitish nation, and Josephus informs us that the reason of the decree was the prediction of an Egyptian prophet, that a Hebrew child was about to be born who would hereafter diminish the power of Egypt and increase that of the Israelites. There is no authority for this in the Scriptures, but it is not at all improbable that the king was impressed by some such notion when he issued his edict respecting the male children.

At the birth of Moses the natural reluctance of his parents to obey the decree was increased by the loveliness of the child. It is noticed with a beautiful simplicity by Moses of himself in his own narrative, that when his mother Jochebed "saw him that he was a goodly child," she concealed his birth three months. At length the extreme danger of a discovery, which would have proved fatal to themselves as well as to the infant, reduced his parents to the cruel necessity of exposing him. His mother constructed a little basket made of bulrushes, or flags of the papyrus, which grows in abundance in the Nile, and of which the ancient Egyptians made boats. It is sufficiently strong to keep out water,

and smooth enough to receive the "slime and pitch" with which it was smeared. This vessel, or basket, made on the same principle, and probably of the same form, as one of those boats constructed of the papyrus with which the Nile was always covered, was "laid in the flags by the brink of the river," and the infant Moses was deposited in it, that it might remain concealed without being carried away by the stream, or that the mother might have convenient access to suckle the child during the night. The sister of Moses, who, according to Calmet, was seven or eight years older than Aaron, watched at a distance by order of the anxious mother, to ascertain his fate and such circumstances as might occur.

It was so ordered by Divine Providence that the infant who lay helpless and exposed on the waters of the Nile was to find a remarkable preserver and protector. The daughter of that very Pharaoh who had issued the barbarous edict against the Hebrew male children came, attended by her women, to bathe in the Nile, probably in compliance with some of the idolatrous customs peculiar to the ancient Egyptians, for the people in all ages, and especially the females, have always expressed their veneration for their noble river and the benefits they receive from it, by plunging into it when it begins to overflow the country. The little vessel containing the infant Moses attracted the attention of the princess, who ordered one of her women to bring it to her, not knowing what it was. When it was opened, to her astonishment the basket was found to contain an infant, who wept when the covering was taken off. The princess, who, according to Josephus, was married, but had no children, was greatly interested at the appearance and helpless condition of the infant, whom she soon discovered on examination to be a Hebrew child, and she resolved to preserve him in defiance of the king's edict. While consulting with her attendants, Miriam approached her, as if an utter stranger to the child, and offered to procure a Hebrew nurse

to suckle him. The princess ordered her to do so, and she accordingly brought the infant's mother, who with unspeakable joy received her son, whose safety was now beyond any threatened danger from the officers appointed to enforce the king's edict. Jochebed was ordered to treat the infant as if he were the son of the princess, and was promised an ample reward for her services. Some years afterwards the daughter of Pharaoh adopted the presumed foundling as her own son, called his name *Moses*, which in the ancient Egyptian language signifies one saved or drawn out of the water—the word for water being *mou* or *mo*, and caused him to be diligently instructed in all the learning of Egypt, then the most civilized country in the world, and at that early period already distinguished for its arts, science, and literature. But his father and mother, to whom he had been restored in the singular manner now narrated, had assiduously instructed him in the religion and worship of the true God, as known and practised by the Hebrews, and it is probable that Moses was well acquainted with all the facts connected with his birth, as well as he was with his real parents. The secret, however, was carefully kept by his relatives, and he grew up the reputed son of the princess. Thus, as Dr Hales observes, did Moses “find an asylum in the very palace of his intended destroyer, while his intercourse with his own family and nation was still most naturally though unexpectedly maintained. So mysterious are the ways of Heaven! and while he was instructed in *all the wisdom of the Egyptians*, and educated in a luxurious court, he acquired at home the knowledge of the promised redemption of Israel, and by faith in the Redeemer Christ, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to have enjoyment of sinful pleasures for a season, esteeming the reproach of Christ, namely, persecution for Christ's sake, greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt, for *he had respect unto the*

recompence of the reward, or looked forward to a future state.”

Many particulars are related by Josephus and other historians of the early life of Moses which are not recorded in the Scriptures, or noticed by the great Hebrew leader himself. Some of these may be fabulous, but tradition is always entitled to some deference when it treats neither of what is marvellous or improbable, and we have no right to suppose that Josephus introduced facts into his account of Moses which did not appear to him authenticated by the best proofs he could obtain. The people of all countries preserve traditions of their great men of antiquity which are not to be found in accredited histories, and these, transmitted orally from generation to generation, very often throw considerable light on the characters of those with whom they are connected. As to the personal appearance of Moses we are told in the Acts of the Apostles that he was “exceedingly fair,” and this may indeed be rendered *beautiful through or in respect to God*, namely, through the Divine blessing; but they may bear a literal interpretation, and if so, we may take the statement of Josephus, that when the illustrious Hebrew lawgiver was only three years old, alluding to the time when he was specially introduced and consigned to Pharaoh's daughter as her adopted son, no one who saw him could avoid being impressed with the singular beauty of his countenance, and the Jewish historian adds that people when engaged in their common avocations would desist to gaze at him. The same authority, followed by Eusebius, informs us that Moses became a man of authority among the Egyptians, distinguished himself as a commander and leader of their armies, and fought some battles against the Ethiopians with great success.

But leaving these traditional details for the present, when Moses was about forty years of age he left the court of Pharaoh, and went to visit his Hebrew countrymen, who groaned under the oppression of their unfeeling masters. He

looked, as he himself states, "on their burdens," and saw that "the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour; and they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field; all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour." Manetho calls the Israelites the leprous shepherds, probably from some tradition concerning the leprosy of Moses subsequently noticed, and says that those shepherds, having greatly increased in the land of Avaris, otherwise Goshen, so as to become a powerful body, began to meditate revolutionary projects, and invited the expelled Shepherd kings to return out of Palestine, which led to the complete re-establishment of the pastoral tyranny under which the Egyptians had groaned before the time of Joseph, in whose day the recollection of which made "every shepherd an abomination." It is possible that the Hebrews had some understanding with that Cushite race which had formerly subverted a native dynasty in Lower Egypt, and whose pasture lands in Goshen, recently inhabited by those Arabs and other nomades, were cultivated by the descendants of Jacob. The Hebrews could otherwise have easily defended the Egyptian frontier, and if they had done so, a fact of such importance would not have been omitted by the sacred historian. But be this as it may, Moses would have repeated opportunities of noticing the tyrannical edicts of Pharaoh against the Israelites, and he naturally wished to be an eye-witness of their oppressions. It is probable, also, that he was secretly impressed with the fact that he was to deliver his nation from bondage, which the extraordinary incidents of his infancy and youth would farther strengthen and confirm. It was during this personal survey of the condition of the Hebrews that he found one of them engaged in conflict with an Egyptian, in which he was likely to be killed. Moses "looked this way and that way, and when he saw that there was no man"—literally, no

spectators of the contest—he ran to the assistance of the Hebrew, slew the Egyptian, and concealed his body in the sand. By comparing the account of this affair given by Moses himself with that in the Acts of the Apostles, it appears that the Hebrew was the injured party. St Stephen declares that Moses saw him "suffer wrong," or "treated injuriously," and that he was oppressed, or exhausted in the struggle, and lay at the mercy of the Egyptian. Moses interfered, and "defended and avenged him," or did him justice by killing the Egyptian, there being probably no other way of doing it, for if the Egyptian had made his complaint to Pharaoh the interference would have been dangerous to Moses. The Israelites had a natural right to rescue themselves from the unjust slavery to which they were reduced, and any one of them had the like right to defend his own life against any single Egyptian who should attack it, though by the death of the aggressor. It is at the same time proper to observe, that neither the word used by the Septuagint, nor by St Stephen concerning Moses as smiting the Egyptian, necessarily signifies that he designed to kill him.

On the following day Moses continued his personal investigation of the condition of the Israelites, when he found two of them quarrelling in a similar manner. He again interfered, but with a mere remonstrance, addressed to the one who was evidently in the wrong. The Hebrew, enraged at this intrusion into a dispute with which he thought Moses had no concern, asked him, in the most insulting manner, "Who made thee a prince and a judge over us? Intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian yesterday?" Alarmed at this unexpected retort, Moses wisely concluded that "the thing was known," and as the voluntary killing of a person was certain death to the aggressor, according to the laws of Egypt, he saw at once the danger he had incurred. He was not wrong in his estimation of the penalty to which he had rendered himself liable,

for when Pharaoh heard it he sought to punish him, and Moses was compelled to save himself by flight. Though he could satisfy his own conscience for having killed the Egyptian, yet, as he had received no commission from God to act publicly as the deliverer and avenger of the oppressed Israelites, he could not well justify the action to Pharaoh, and his safety would be ensured by using the only means of preservation, namely, by withdrawing from the jurisdiction of the Egyptian tyrant.

The scene of the retreat and exile of Moses was the land of Midian, a part of Arabia Petræa on the Red Sea, the inhabitants of which were early addicted to commerce. Josephus informs us that the people of this part of Midian were not shepherds, but he adds rather contradictorily that they left the care of their flocks to women. This, however, agrees with the fact of Jethro's flock being watered by his daughter, and to this day it is the existing practice of the people of this part of the ancient Midian, where the duty of attending the flocks is considered degrading by the men, and is more entirely left to the young women than perhaps in any other part of Arabia.

Moses fled in the direction whither he was subsequently to lead the Israelites after their departure from Egypt, and wandered in the singular peninsula of Sinai in Arabia Petræa, where the great Jehovah was afterwards to display his mighty power at the delivery of the Law to his chosen people. The whole route was through a desert, and he was about eight days' journey from Egypt when he came to the immediate neighbourhood of the rocky and twin peaks of Horeb and Sinai. He sat down by a well, when the seven daughters of a person, who is called the priest or prince of Midian, drew near to water their father's flocks. This pastoral prince or emir was called Jethro, otherwise Reuel, so that either Reuel was his name as well as Jethro, or Reuel was the father of Jethro, and therefore grandfather of those young women, for it is usual in Scripture to call the grand-

father *father*; and we find in the case of Rebekah, that though she is designated Abraham's brother's daughter, she was in reality his grand-daughter, Gen. xxiv. 48. The daughters of Jethro were actively employed in "filling the troughs to water their father's flock," when some of the neighbouring shepherds appeared for the same purpose. This well appears to have been public property, for if it had been private, or had belonged to Jethro, the dispute for the water which occurred, and the conduct of the Arab shepherds to the daughters of a friendly chief, would not have been permitted. Moses, seeing the females violently driven from the well, hastened to their assistance, repelled the rude nomades, and rendered Jethro's daughters such active and efficient assistance that their father was astonished at their return so early from an avocation often tedious and protracted, by interruptions similar to that now noticed. Jethro inquired the cause of their early return, and his daughters informed him—"An Egyptian delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds, and also drew water enough for us, and watered the flock." We here see that they took Moses, from his appearance and speech, to be an Egyptian, being well acquainted with the habits and language of the people of that country. Jethro, in the hospitable spirit of a nomade chief, asked his daughters where their friendly protector was, and desired them to invite him to "eat bread." An intimacy was thus formed between the family of Jethro and Moses, which caused a more tender relationship. Moses was "content to dwell with the man, and he gave him Zipporah his daughter" to be his wife. We may infer that this was done much on the same principle as Jacob served Laban for Leah and Rachel, as we find Moses following the pastoral occupation, and tending the flocks of his father-in-law. It is to be observed also, that the sacred writers do not relate all the particulars of a story, as is usually the case with other authors, but only those facts which are most material. Hence we may suppose

that many things intervened between the first introduction of Moses to Jethro's family, and his marriage to his daughter, especially when we consider that his children were young when he returned to Egypt after an absence of forty years. An author (Bryant) observes, that as this marriage of Moses was contrary to the usage of his forefathers and of the Hebrews in general, it seems to intimate that he thought himself quite alienated from his countrymen. This supposition is supported by the name which he gave to his first-born son. He tells us that he called him Gershom, for he said, "I have been a stranger in a strange land." This was in allusion to his peculiar circumstances, and he acted in a similar manner when his other son Eleazer was born. He called him by that name, which signifies *my God is my help*, "for the God of my father," said he, "was mine help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh."—"During his long exile," observes Dr Hales, "Moses was trained in the school of adversity for that arduous mission which he had anticipated, and so became 'very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.' No man had greater trials, or more occasion for meekness, and his humility was equal thereto. His backwardness afterwards to undertake that mission for which he was destined from the womb, was no less remarkable than his forwardness before."

While Moses was thus sojourning in the rocky peninsula of Sinai the king of Egypt died. This was either the Pharaoh who sought to kill him for slaying the Egyptian, or his immediate successor. The kings of Egypt by whom the Hebrews were oppressed cannot now be identified, nor can we ascertain with any degree of certainty even the dynasty to which they belonged. Until the reign of Psammetichus, the fifth king of the twenty-sixth dynasty, the early history of that remarkable country is involved in great obscurity. But the oppressions of the Hebrews were not alleviated by the deaths of their tyrants. On the

contrary, every successor seemed to add to their miseries, and they were reduced almost to a state of despair. Moses tells us that "the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage, and God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob; and God looked upon the children of Israel, and God had respect unto them." These fine intimations of the Divine compassion towards His oppressed people are preparatory to the introduction of the narrative of the commission and subsequent proceedings of Moses. The Almighty Jehovah permitted those calamities to befall His people to exercise their virtue, patience, and resignation to the divine will—to keep up a distinction between them and the Egyptians which friendly usage might have destroyed—to prepare and make them willing to leave Egypt when God should command them to depart—to enable them to appreciate their future deliverance—and to make them obedient to His injunctions, whenever they remembered that "house of bondage" in which they had suffered much and been detained long.

As the narrative of Moses now introduces to us his remarkable call, which happened B.C. 1491, according to the Hebrew chronology, it becomes us to take a brief view of what the Israelites were compelled to do in Egypt during their long continued oppression by the pastoral tyrants. Various have been the conjectures on this subject, some contending for one thing and some for another, without duly considering that the language of Moses may be very extensively interpreted—that the *treasures* cities of Pharaoh, which they were necessitated to build (Exod. i. 11), and the *straw compacted bricks* which they were compelled to make, even when deprived of the straw which had been previously supplied to them (Exod. v. 7, 10, 11), evidently imply that they were employed in every kind of public work which was

undertaken in those times. Josephus, who adopts this view, informs us that the Hebrews were obliged to learn mechanical arts, and to accustom themselves to hard labour; and that they were made to cut canals, to raise embankments, to build the walls of cities, and to erect pyramids. It appears that when Moses commenced his mission, the Hebrews were employed chiefly in making large bricks, compacted with straw and dried in the sun, and it has consequently been argued that only structures formed of such materials could have been their work. But there is no necessity to suppose that because the Hebrews were making bricks when Moses returned from Midian invested with the divine commission to achieve the delivery of Israel, they had done nothing else during the preceding eighty or one hundred years. It is distinctly stated by Moses himself that the oppression of his countrymen commenced before he was born, and he also states that he was about eighty years of age when he received the divine call at the base of the celebrated and awe-inspiring Mount of God in the peninsula of Sinai. Julius Africanus makes the duration of the dynasty of the Shepherd kings who oppressed the Hebrews to extend to two hundred and eighty-four years, Josephus two hundred and sixty, while Eusebius reduces the period to one hundred and six years; but the length of time need occasion no difficulty, for it is not necessary to suppose that the oppression of the Hebrews commenced under the first king of the dynasty, and it is evident that it began when their numbers had so increased as to awaken the suspicions of the government. As to the statement of Josephus about the pyramids, it has been often disputed by alleging that these enormous monuments of ancient Egyptian folly and slavery are all of stone. But to this it is answered, that the pyramids are not *all* of stone. There are large brick pyramids at Dashour, Saccara, and Faioum, the ancient Arsinoë. The large bricks of which these pyramids, and particularly that of

Faioum, are formed, are made of black, loamy, friable earth, or mud from the Nile, compacted with chopped straw in the same way that bricks are still made in Egypt and elsewhere in the East, and probably the same as those made by the Hebrews. As a farther reply to the objection that the pyramids are all of stone, Herodotus, who describes the celebrated Tower of Babylon as a pyramid with graduated stones diminishing with the ascent, mentions the Pyramids of Egypt as being similarly constructed, with stones or platforms diminishing in size as they rose in height, and he is understood to state that these pyramids were afterwards completed to a smooth surface by being coated with *blocks of stone*, which filled up the interstices between the different stories so as to obliterate the graduated by a sloping appearance. Recent observations have confirmed this account of their construction. Nor does it follow, though the Pyramids were all of stone, that the Hebrews did not work in that material as well as in brick. As already remarked, the language of Moses must be understood in its widest extent, as intimating that his oppressed people were employed in every species of work to which they were summoned by the tyranny of their masters, and it is this view of his statements which can convey to us any idea of the sufferings they endured in their "house of bondage."

While Moses was in Midian he is supposed to have written or received the materials for the Book of the venerable Arabian Patriarch Job, but as this subject is discussed in its proper place (see *Job*), it is merely noticed here in passing. It may, however, be observed, that it can hardly be supposed that a man like Moses, who was skilled in all the learning of Egypt, would not, during a residence of forty years in the lone wilds of Midian, find other employment to relieve the listlessness and monotony of his shepherd occupation. On the contrary, it is not extravagant to conjecture that he would cultivate and improve in that retirement those arts and sciences he had been

taught in his youth. But his mind would be chiefly occupied in reflecting on the sufferings of the Israelites, and he would often feel deeply interested in the circumstances of his family whom he had left in Egypt—of his brother Aaron and his sister Miriam. While thus meditating on the various and wonderful operations of Providence, the time arrived when he was to receive the divine call to the great work for which he had been set apart as the instrument from his birth. He tells us that he “kept the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, the priest of Midian, and he led the flock to the back side of the desert, and came to the mountain of God, even to Horeb.” This mountain is sometimes also called Sinai, because Horeb and Sinai are rugged granite peaks of the same mountain, and Moses here calls it the “mountain of God,” because when he wrote the Book of Exodus those transactions had taken place at its base and on its summit which well entitled it to the distinguishing appellation. It is now called *Djebel Mousa*, or the Mount of Moses, by the Arabs. The sacred locality has been for centuries under the guardianship of a body of Greek monks, who occupy a convent at the foot of the mountain, called the Convent of St Catharine, by whose name the mountain is also designated. They state that the original church built here by the Empress Helena, the mother of Constantine, was erected over the spot where the Divine Presence was manifested to Moses, and which is now included within the precincts of the present fortified convent founded by the Emperor Justinian. At no great distance is the scene pointed out by the monks where tradition says Moses kept the flock of Jethro—a valley at the back of the Mount, between two ranges of mountains, in the centre of which is a solitary groupe of trees. In this wilderness of the peninsula, which is approached by a mournful and terrific yet ever-varying valley, where the softness and beauty of nature are completely excluded, and where the stern scenery seems to proclaim the land of miracles, which had

been visited by the thunders, and lightning, and terrors of Jehovah—a region appearing to the enterprising traveller who treads this extraordinary wilderness to have an unearthly character, suited to the sound of the fearful trumpet which was once heard there—commenced that series of transactions which have had no parallel in the world, and which mark the mysterious ways of Providence to man.

It was in this solitude that a bush appeared to Moses as if in a flame of fire, yet its vegetation was neither destroyed nor its foliage injured—he “looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.” We are told that the “angel of the Lord” was in it, but that angel, from the whole context, was no created intelligence—he was not one of those “ministering spirits” who surround the throne of the Most High, and who are sometimes made, as it were, “flames of fire”—but God the Son, the Second Person of the glorious Trinity, who might properly be called an angel, because in the fulness of time He was to be sent into the world from God, in the likeness of sinful man, as a Divine Messenger, and as the Messenger foretold. Moses in astonishment turned towards this extraordinary appearance, saying, “I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt.” While so doing a voice called to him from the bush—“Moses, Moses,” to which he answered, “Here am I.” The great Jehovah again addressed him—“Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.” It is here intimated that the place was made holy by the special presence of God for a particular object, in the same manner as in after times the tabernacle, the temple, and the utensils belonging to them, with all things appropriated to divine service, were called holy, and could not be used on ordinary occasions; and as in the Christian Church all things are holy to God—His house, His sacraments, His word—all may be said to be holy ground, and

ought to be approached with the most profound reverence, the most sincere intentions, and with the most upright resolutions.

The injunction, *put off thy shoes from off thy feet*, was and still is an outward intimation of reverence in Oriental countries, which was probably derived from the Patriarchs. In those countries the people throw off their slippers on the occasions when we take off our hats, and never uncover their heads. Whether among Christians, Mahometans, or Pagans, it would be considered in the highest degree irreverent to enter a building set apart to religion with the feet covered. This practice was observed by the Jewish priests in the service of the tabernacle, though there is no command for it in the Law of Moses. It is also the common mode of showing respect in the ordinary intercourse of life in the East, and its observance consequently influences the costume of the head and the feet, the covering of the former being such that it cannot be replaced without trouble, while loose and easy slippers are worn, which can be thrown off and resumed without any inconvenience.

Moses obeyed the Divine injunction. He listened to the voice of God speaking to him from the apparently burning yet still luxuriant foliage, and received his commission to go to Pharaoh and demand the release of the Hebrews, and to act as their leader and guide, assured of the protection and favour of Jehovah. He would have excused himself from accepting this important and onerous office. After listening with becoming reverence and awe to the Divine declaration, he expressed his unfitness for the work—"Who am I that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?" To this Jehovah graciously replied—"Certainly I will be with thee, and this shall be a token unto thee that I have sent thee: when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain." Moses still hesitated as to the manner in which his

announcement might be received by the Israelites. He tells us that he stated to the Divine Majesty—"Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say unto me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?" Jehovah answered in language expressive of his eternal unchangeableness, and of his being the same "yesterday, to-day, and for ever," or, as St John expresses it in the Apocalypse, "which is, and which was, and which is to come." He did not say that he was this or that particular Being. The Egyptians were curious in attempts to name persons in a peculiar manner even before the days of Moses, and the Israelites thought a person well designated when his name expressed his character. The same observation applies to the name or names which Jehovah thought fit to give himself, descriptive of his attributes (Exod. xxxiii. 18, 19; xxxiv. 5, 6, 7), and the design of Moses in asking God's name was to obtain information concerning the Divine nature and attributes, that he might know what duties He required from the Israelites, and how they were to serve Him. Jehovah replied—"I AM THAT I AM—Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." Respecting this conversation between the Almighty Jehovah and Moses, it is admirably remarked by Bishop Warburton—"So great at this time was the degeneracy of the Israelites in Egypt, and so sensible was Moses of its effects, in ignorance of, or alienation from, the true God, that he would willingly have declined the office, and when absolutely commanded to undertake it, he desired that God would let him know by what name He would be called, when the people should ask the name of the God of their fathers. In this we see a people not only lost to all knowledge of the unity, as the asking for a name necessarily implied their opinion of a plurality, but likewise possessed with the very spirit of, Egyptian idolatry. The religion of names was a matter of

great consequence in Egypt—it was one of their essential superstitions—it was one of their native inventions, and the first of them which they communicated to the Greeks. A *name* was a peculiar adjunct to a local tutelary deity. Out of indulgence to this weakness God was pleased to give Himself a name, where we may observe, according to the constant method of Divine Wisdom, when it condescends to the prejudices of men, how in the very instance of indulgence to their superstition He gives a correction of it. The religion of names arose from an idolatrous polytheism, and the name here given, which implies eternity and self-existence, directly opposes that superstition."

In the farther instructions which Moses received he was more particularly informed—"Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial;" or, By this name I will be remembered throughout all generations. He was then told to announce to them their deliverance from the bondage of their Egyptian oppressors, and their possession of that country promised to their Patriarchal ancestors, so rich, so fertile, and so advantageous, that it was described as "flowing with milk and honey." Moses was next instructed as to his intercourse and proceedings with Pharaoh. He was to demand permission from the king to allow the Hebrews to proceed three days' journey into the wilderness, to sacrifice to "the Lord their God." It was also intimated to him that Pharaoh would not listen to his application, until Jehovah "stretched out his hand, and smote Egypt with all his wonders which he would do in the midst thereof," but that when they were allowed to go they would not "go empty," for "every woman shall borrow of her neighbour, and her that sojourneth in her house, jewels of gold and jewels of silver, and raiment; and ye shall put them upon your sons, and

upon your daughters, and ye shall spoil the Egyptians." The word translated *borrow* in this and the parallel passage (Exod. xii. 35) is very improperly so rendered. Its real meaning is *to ask or to demand*, as the Psalmist employs it (Psalm ii. 8), "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." There is no propriety in supposing that a people *borrowed* jewels of silver and gold who were never to return to repay them, and the meaning of the passage is, that the Egyptians would be reduced to such a state of alarm and despair when the Israelites would be permitted to depart, that they would freely give them whatsoever they asked. Josephus represents this fact in a sense more agreeable to the original of the inspired text. He says that the Egyptians made the Hebrews considerable presents—that some did so to induce them to depart in greater haste, and others from motives of friendship and personal acquaintance. Dr Hales justly observes, that "on the present mistranslation has been grafted a calumny against the Israelites, as if they cheated the Egyptians." While on this subject, a traditionary story occurs to recollection which Professor Jahn relates in the following manner—"Alexander the Great sent a colony of Jews to people Alexandria, and he granted them equal privileges with the Macedonians. It is said that the Egyptians appeared before Alexander, and requested that the Jews might be forced to reimburse the value of the gold, silver, and precious stones, which their ancestors had lent them at their departure from Egypt under Moses. The Jews allowed the justice of the claim of the Egyptians, and consented to pay them, provided, however, that they too would satisfy their demands for the services of four hundred years which their fathers had rendered to the Egyptians. Alexander decided that the claims of the Egyptians and Jews balanced each other. The latter are so assured of the truth of this tradition, that they perpetuate the

memory of this decision by a yearly festival in the month of March."

Moses still hesitated, from a just sense of the greatness of the undertaking, and a consciousness of his own inability. He supposed, not without reason, that the Hebrews would give no credit to his declarations—that they would demand proofs that "the Lord had appeared unto him," and he asked for such signs as would convince them that he had a commission for their deliverance. He was told to cast on the ground the rod or staff which he generally used for driving his flock, and he had no sooner done so than it became an animated serpent, from which he fled in terror. He was told to seize the living reptile by the tail, and when he did so it became a rod in his hand as before. This was to be one sign which Moses was to repeat when he appealed to the Israelites, to demonstrate to them that he was divinely commissioned by the God of their fathers. Again, he was commanded—"Put now thine hand into thy bosom," and when "he took it out, behold his hand was leprous as snow." His hand was restored, or "turned again as his other flesh," by a similar action, and the object of this second miraculous sign was, that if the first failed to convince the people of the truth of his mission, he was to use the second; and if these would not be sufficient he was promised a third, which was to take water from the Nile, and turn it into blood before their eyes; but this last sign was not wrought, because Moses was in the desert, and far from the river. "It was necessary," says Bishop Patrick, "that Moses should be furnished with all these powers, because he came with an unusual commission, which would not have been credited unless confirmed by such extraordinary proof. All the prophets after him did not work miracles, which were necessary only when some great change was to be effected in the world, and this was the case now at the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt. After this they were to be put into a new form and order by a body of peculiar laws

both civil and religious; and when these laws were violated, God was pleased, by such wonders as Moses wrought, to turn their hearts back again, as he did in the days of Elijah."

Still Moses felt reluctant to undertake the important office, and urged a strong objection. "O my Lord," he anxiously said, "I am not eloquent [in the Hebrew *a man of words*], neither heretofore [*since yesterday nor since the third day*], nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant; but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue." He was, however, assured that his imperfection of speech would be removed—"I," said Jehovah, "will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say." Various conjectures have been advanced respecting this impediment which Moses possessed according to his statement, and Oriental fancy has accounted for or explained it by a number of traditional theories; but no observing reader of the writings of Moses can doubt that he was in truth what he is designated by St Stephen, "mighty in words," for numerous instances occur of his eloquence. Yet it is not to be believed that he acquired this ability from his Egyptian education any more than that he was by it made "mighty in deeds" also, which the first martyr, himself a man of no common eloquence, joins to his power "in words," and in which he was undoubtedly assisted in an extraordinary manner by the Deity. Driven from all his excuses, Moses was at last compelled to declare openly that he was not inclined to undertake the office, and to entreat Jehovah to provide some other messenger. "O Lord," he said, "send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt [*or shouldst*] send." His reluctance, according to Stackhouse, appears to have been produced by some such considerations as these—"He had long lost the influence he formerly possessed in Egypt—he had already experienced the ingratitude of the Hebrews, and their rejection of his services—perhaps, also, he was still mindful of the danger which had caused him to take

refuge in Midian—besides, he was aware of the great weight of the employment, and conscious of his own infirmities. These considerations may serve to account for the backwardness of Moses, and perhaps go some way towards excusing it." Be this as it may, we are told by Moses himself that "the anger of the Lord was kindled against him," and the manner in which he records this fact seems to imply that Jehovah was highly displeased at him, though probably, as Bishop Patrick remarks, "this anger amounted only to such displeasure as a father conceives against a son when he is too diffident, notwithstanding all that he has said or done to inspire him with a just confidence." Jehovah answered Moses—"Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well, and also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee, and when he seeth thee, he will be glad in his heart." The manner of Aaron's introduction into the history is worthy of notice. He at once appears as a kind of assistant, and so far he is inferior to Moses, yet he had evidently some advantages. He was the elder brother, an eloquent speaker, and favoured by divine inspiration. We have no cause assigned for Moses being preferred in respect of authority, and it would be presumptuous to assign any other than the good pleasure of Jehovah.

Moses was enjoined to take "his rod in his hand," with which he was to "do signs." He returned to his father-in-law Jethro from this important interview, satisfied that he could no longer resist the Divine command. To Jethro he related none of the transactions which had occurred, at least he gives no intimation to that effect, and he simply requested him to sanction his immediate return to Egypt. "Let me go, I pray thee, and return unto my brethren which are in Egypt, and see whether they be yet alive." The priest of Midian offered no opposition. He told him to "go in peace," and Moses was farther encouraged by a Divine communication—"Go, return into Egypt, for all the men are dead which sought

thy life." He took his wife Zipporah, and his sons Gershom and Eleazar, and left the scene of his pastoral retirement with "the rod of God in his hand," with which he was to perform many signs and wonders before the astonished Egyptians. It was again intimated to him by a Divine communication what he was to say to Pharaoh, and to announce to him the threatening of Jehovah—"Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born; and I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me; and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born."

Moses narrates an incident which occurred during the journey. "It came to pass by the way in the inn that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him." By the rendering *the inn*, our translators have used a very modern term, which does not convey the sense of the original. The Hebrew word simply signifies where they rested all night—probably in a cave, or under the shade of trees. We are farther told that *the Lord met him, and sought to kill him*. This means that Moses was afflicted with some sudden and violent disease, in which the hand of Jehovah appeared lifted up in such a manner as if he intended to kill him, for neglecting to circumcise his son. The operation was performed by his wife Zipporah with a sharp knife made of stone—an instrument anciently used in Egypt and the adjacent countries, and employed by the Jews in that rite, though not enjoined by the Law, from custom, convenience, or from a supposition that it was less dangerous than metal. As soon as the child was circumcised "the Lord let Moses go"—namely, he recovered from threatened death. Zipporah twice exclaimed—"A bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision." Some interpret this to have been spoken in a pettish humour, and others understand it uttered in a strain of joy, as if intimating that she had saved her husband's life by circumcising his child. "There seems to have been some hesitation on the part of the woman," says

Bryant, "but the alternative was death or obedience. Alarmed, therefore, at her husband's danger, which was imminent, she performed the operation, concluding with a bitter taunt—'Surely a bloody husband art thou to me.' Moses by his acquiescence had brought down the necessary interposition of the Deity; for how could it be expected that a person could be a promulgator of God's law, who had been guilty of a violation of one of the first and most essential articles, and persevered in this neglect?" It is difficult to conceive a reason for the conduct of Moses in this important matter, unless we are to suppose that it was by the influence of Zipporah. He well knew that when God made a covenant with Abraham, circumcision was ordained as a test of it, and as the distinguishing mark of all those who were to be admitted to the privileges of this covenant. It was enjoined in strong terms, and attended with this penalty to the uncircumcised person—"that soul shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my covenant."

It was after this transaction that Moses met his brother Aaron in the desert towards Egypt, after their long separation. Aaron was instructed to meet his brother by a divine communication, and Moses before he left the residence of his father-in-law had been also informed—"Behold he (Aaron) cometh forth to meet thee, and when he seeth thee he will be glad in his heart." Among the confirming signs given by God to Moses, we must reckon this meeting with his brother, which, being intimated by Jehovah, and directly happening, was most convincing and conclusive. It may be safely inferred that Aaron would not have undertaken a long journey from Egypt at great hazard, unless he had been well satisfied with the authority by which he was induced to do so, and he could not have expected to find Moses where he found him, unless by divine direction. As Aaron, therefore, was a sign to Moses, by meeting him in the silent and unfrequented desert, so Moses was also a similar sign to Aaron. The

brothers recognized the superintending providence of God—they saw and were convinced of the genuineness of their commission—that the work they had undertaken was the work of God, the achievement of which would redound to his glory, and render them illustrious in the annals of their nation, then oppressed but speedily to be emancipated from that intolerable tyranny which "made their lives bitter with hard bondage."

Moses informs us that he told his brother Aaron "all the words of the Lord who had sent him, and all the signs which he had commanded him." We now see the shepherd of Horeb, the man of "slow speech," arrived on the confines of Egypt, with a design to free the chosen people. If we set aside all divine or supernatural assistance, he stands single and unsupported, without one requisite advantage for the accomplishment of his purpose; and how can we, independent of such assistance, suppose a person so circumstanced capable of even attempting a scheme so arduous in its execution? He set out accompanied only by his wife and family to perform what the united wisdom and experience of the elders could not accomplish; he was joined by his brother in the desert; and how are two individuals—the one long an exile from Egypt—to congregate together nearly a million of people scattered over the face of the country, and persuade them to follow them to Canaan? Moses was unknown at the Egyptian court, and was not endowed with the powers or blandishments of persuasive eloquence, yet how was he to get access to the reigning prince, and demand the release of so many useful subjects? No other answer could he expect from the sovereign on such an occasion than that which was actually given, accompanied by an imposition of a double task upon the people sufficient to make them detest Moses, to ruin him in their estimation, and to frustrate all his views. These were difficulties, it will be admitted by every impartial mind, which neither the wisdom nor the ability of man could remove.

Nevertheless they were removed by Him who alone can order the unruly will and affections of his creatures. He suffered the Israelites to be in perplexity and distress, that they might wish for deliverance and be ready to obey. Accordingly, upon the display of his wonders they acknowledged the hand of Omnipotence, and proffered obedience to his commissioned messengers. Moses and Aaron, when they entered Goshen, congregated the elders or heads of the tribes, and "Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed; and when they heard that the Lord had visited the children of Israel, and that he had looked upon their affliction, then they bowed their heads and worshipped."

Moses and Aaron now sought an audience of Pharaoh, probably attended by some of the elders of the people, but of the manner in which this access was obtained we have no information. Aaron appears to have been a governor over the Israelites, though he was under the authority of Pharaoh's officers, and we do not read of any charge of intrusion into office or assuming it made either by Pharaoh or the Israelites. Both Moses and Aaron were acknowledged by Pharaoh himself, and by many of his principal officers, to be persons of great consideration, and they were heard as those who had a right to plead and remonstrate on behalf of the Israelites. In this first audience Moses demanded permission for the Hebrews to go three days' journey into the Wilderness, to celebrate a festival, and to sacrifice to Jehovah. This was the original petition, and the terms of it excited no surprise or suspicion, as it is probable that similar religious pilgrimages are of the most remote antiquity. Moses preferred his request in the name of Jehovah, and the motives of the journey were well understood by Pharaoh. The Hebrews wished to celebrate their festival in the solitudes of the frontier wilderness of Egypt, where they would be unmolested, and give no offence

to the Egyptians by making them the witnesses of their peculiar rites and ceremonies. The haughty Pharaoh proudly exclaimed—"Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go." He owned those deities worshipped by the Egyptians, but he owed no allegiance, as he thought, to that God whom Moses called Jehovah, because he knew not whom they meant by Him. Moses and Aaron in reply explained themselves more particularly—"The God of the Hebrews hath met with us; let us go, we pray thee, three days' journey into the desert, and sacrifice unto the Lord our God, lest he fall upon us with pestilence or with the sword." They designated Jehovah by a more ancient title—the *God of the Hebrews*—which the Egyptians ought to have known and respected from the days of Abraham; and it is to be observed that in their first interview they neither wrought any miracle nor threatened any divine judgments against Pharaoh, but submissively represented to him the danger to which they would themselves be exposed if they did not obey God. So far, therefore, from acknowledging the message delivered by Moses and Aaron as one sent from a superior power, he declared that he knew no such power, accused Moses and Aaron of encouraging the people to idleness, and in contempt of them he ordered their labours to be increased, instead of allowing them that relaxation which they demanded. To add to their miseries, the essential material in the making of the sun-dried bricks was ordered not to be supplied—they were to find it themselves wherever they could, and yet the "tale" of bricks was not to be diminished. This material, as the reader is aware, was the straw employed to mix with and compact the mass of clay used in making sun-dried bricks, which are still commonly made in Egypt, and their ancient use in that country is evinced by the brick pyramids of Faioum and Dashour, already mentioned. The taskmasters "hasted" the oppressed Hebrews, who

were scattered abroad throughout the country gathering stubble instead of straw, and presumptuously said to them, "Fulfil your works, your daily tasks, as when there was straw." We are also told that the "officers of the children of Israel which Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them were beaten." This is quite in accordance with the practice of Oriental countries at the present day, where men of all ranks and ages are continually liable to be beaten in a moment of displeasure or caprice of their sovereigns, who hand them over to the beaters of carpets, and these persons castigate them with sticks as if they were dogs. The consequence is, that personal chastisement in those countries is not considered a disgrace, but merely a misfortune, limited to the pain inflicted, or to the degree of displeasure on the part of the superior which it is presumed to express. The only reply which the Israelites received to their complaints from those tyrannical taskmasters was—"Ye are idle, ye are idle; therefore ye say, Let us go and do sacrifice to the Lord; go therefore now, and work, for there shall no straw be given you, yet shall ye deliver the tale of bricks." In the anguish of their hearts, and with such accumulated misery, they ascribed their sufferings to Moses and Aaron, whom they accused of causing them "to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants, to put a sword in their hands to slay them."

The misfortunes which resulted from this first application to Pharaoh made a deep impression on Moses, and probably would have prevented him from appearing again before the king, if he had not been encouraged by fresh assurances from Jehovah of the divine determination to rescue the Israelites with a triumphant arm. Moses was invested with a miraculous power over Pharaoh, to be exercised in such displays of divine judgment on that obstinate tyrant as should eventually compel him to dismiss the Hebrews. This Pharaoh cannot now be identified, though several writers take him to be Chencheres, the eleventh king of

the eighteenth Diospolitic dynasty, because Besorus says that he with his army was destroyed in the Red Sea; but that opinion is encumbered with many difficulties. "It may be sufficient to remark," says Jahn, "that Besorus, a Babylonian, could scarcely obtain very accurate information on this subject; and that the Hebrews were not oppressed by a Diospolitic king, but by the Pharaohs of Lower Egypt." In the Egyptian dynasties of Manetho one Amosis is mentioned, in whose reign, it is said, Moses went out of Egypt; but where all is conjecture it would be idle to speculate, and we must be content with the fact as recorded by the sacred historian, for no other writers can assist us in the investigation.

Encouraged by Jehovah, and positively assured of the ultimate deliverance of the Hebrews, Moses attempted to revive their hopes; but they "hearkened not unto him, for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage." At the next interview with Pharaoh a miracle was wrought, to convince the king of the authority with which Moses and Aaron were invested, and the rod of the latter was transformed into a living serpent in presence of the monarch and his attendants. Astonished at this remarkable occurrence, the magicians and sorcerers, two of whom are mentioned by St Paul by name—Jannes and Jambres—were summoned, and their rods also became serpents, which were "swallowed up" by Aaron's rod. It is not mentioned how these transformations were effected, nor is it perhaps necessary. In relating these miracles of the Egyptian sorcerers, Moses evidently expresses himself throughout as if they really produced the same effects, so that Pharaoh and his attendants might be at first persuaded that the power of the Egyptian magicians was really equal to his own. Either the rods of the magicians became real serpents by the divine permission, or they became so only in appearance—a deception being practised on the spectators; or the magicians might have brought thither real serpents, such as those carried about by the serpent-charmers and

others in that country at the present day, after extracting from them their poisonous fangs. The original phrase, *for they did so, or in like manner*, may only indicate the attempt and not the deed; for we afterwards find that in the plague of lice, when the magicians "did so with their enchantments," they "*could not.*" Besides, the term rendered *their enchantments* fully expresses some deception to impose on the spectators. It is also to be observed, that as the magicians had notice of the miracle they were expected to imitate, it was easy for men well acquainted with the secret deceptions of legerdmain to bring living serpents; and though Aaron's serpent swallowed up their serpents, showing the superiority of the true miracle over the false, it might only lead the king to conclude that Moses and Aaron were more expert jugglers than Jannes and Jambres who opposed them. The authors of the Universal History assign the following reasons for the part which the magicians were enabled to sustain in this extraordinary transaction. "First, It was necessary that they should be suffered to exert the utmost of their power against Moses, in order to clear him from the imputation of magic or sorcery, to which, considering the notions then prevalent, he might have been exposed if they had not entered into this competition with him, and been at length overcome. Second, In order to confirm the faith of the wavering and desponding Israelites, by making them see the difference between Moses, who acted by the power of God, and the magicians, who acted by some inferior power. Third, In order to preserve them afterwards from being seduced by any false miracle from the worship of the true God."

We are now introduced to the series of the celebrated plagues inflicted by Jehovah on the Egyptians; and the nature of these plagues will be more thoroughly appreciated when it is considered they were all, with the exception of the last, connected more or less with the objects of their religious veneration. That terrible plague—the death of the first-

born throughout the land, was indeed an exception—but one which more directly addressed itself to the love of self-preservation natural to man, and was the more appalling in its consequences, because it would excite all their superstitious fears, and induce them to believe that the objects of their worship, which had been made the instruments of their punishment, had visited them with that summary vengeance, which would be carried to a most alarming extent if the king persisted in his obstinate determination to prevent the departure of the Israelites. This is obvious from the confession of the Egyptians themselves, who, when that plague was inflicted, were most urgent that the Israelites should immediately leave the country, "*for,*" they said, "*lest we be all dead men.*" But not to anticipate, let us here attend to the narrative of Moses, and to the truly astonishing and unparalleled events which succeeded each other. We are told that the Lord "*hardened Pharaoh's heart that he hearkened not*" to Moses and Aaron. This fact was intimated by Jehovah himself to Moses; and here it ought to be carefully noticed that the rendering should rather be—*and the heart of Pharaoh was hardened*, that he would not listen to their request, as God had informed Moses—an interpretation which is adopted in all the ancient versions without exception, and in the best modern translations. The alteration is certainly no more than verbal, yet it ought to be pointed out, as it is inconsistent with the rendering of the same phrase, and of a phrase with the same construction afterwards (Exod. vii. 22; viii. 19; ix. 7); and it is plain from the whole history that Pharaoh hardened his heart several times before God resolved to punish him for tyranny and injustice. The act of hardening was Pharaoh's own, for he was repeatedly warned of the consequences which would ensue *before* the infliction of each plague, and there is no other hardening implied than what proceeded from his own settled resolution not to lose the services of the Israelites. The request of Moses, how-

ever, as originally preferred, was reasonable and natural. It was only permission to go three days' journey into the wilderness to perform certain religious acts unmolested, at which he knew well the Egyptians would have been exasperated if practised in their own country, and although that three days' journey was not the whole that was intended, Moses was not necessitated to make such a bitter enemy as Pharaoh acquainted with his design. As there was no allegiance due, there was no faith broken. The Israelites were not the subjects of Pharaoh, and as he had no right to detain them in Egypt against their inclinations, he had a still less right to treat a free-born people as slaves. The whole was a case of unjust usurpation and despotism on his part, and of unmerited oppression endured by them. Moses acted by the instructions of Jehovah, and was ordered to demand no more at first than the three days' journey into the wilderness, to make the tyranny of Pharaoh the more manifest by denying such a simple request, and the Divine vengeance at once just and indisputable. The conduct of Pharaoh being thus necessarily connected in the narrative with his punishment, the fine observations of Philo the Jew on the plagues of Egypt may be here introduced with propriety. "Some," he says, "perhaps may inquire, why did God punish the country by such minute and contemptible animals as frogs, lice, and flies, rather than by bears, lions, leopards, or other kinds of savage beasts, which prey on human flesh? or, if not by these, why not by the Egyptian asp, whose bite is instant death? But let him learn if he be ignorant, first, that God chose rather to correct than to destroy the inhabitants, for if He desired to annihilate them utterly, He had no need to have made use of animals as his auxiliaries, but of the divinely inflicted evils of famine and pestilence. Next let him further learn that lesson so necessary for every state of life, namely, that men when they war seek the most powerful aid to supply their own weakness, but God, the highest and

greatest power, who stands in need of nothing, if at any time He chooses to employ instruments, as it were, to inflict chastisements, chooses not the strongest and greatest, disregarding their strength, but rather the mean and the minute, which He endues with irresistible power to chastise offenders."

The *first plague* was the turning of the water of the Nile into blood, which caused the fish in it to perish, and the river to emit a disgusting and intolerable stench. Moses was commanded to meet Pharaoh in the morning as he proceeded towards the Nile, either for the purposes of recreation or to worship the river, as was usual with the Egyptians, or as he was preparing for his morning purification—the Egyptians esteeming it a part of their religion to wash themselves in the river twice or thrice every day. Moses was to "stand by the river's brink," with the rod which had been turned to a serpent in his hand, and thus to address Pharaoh—"The Lord God of the Hebrews hath sent me unto thee, saying, Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness, and behold, hitherto thou wouldst not hear. Thus saith the Lord, In this thou shalt know that I am the Lord; behold, I will smite with the rod that is in mine hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And the fish that is in the river shall die, and the river shall stink, and the Egyptians shall loathe to drink of the water of the river." It appears from the manner in which the narrative is continued that Pharaoh treated this announcement with contempt, and that he either thought it impossible to effect such a change on the water of that noble river—to the whole Egyptians an object of religious worship, or that it was a mere boast of Moses to terrify him into compliance. But he soon discovered that his own proud conclusions were fallacious. At the Divine command Moses and Aaron took the mysterious rod, and waved it, as it were, from the place on the margin of the Nile where they stood, over the broad expanse of the river, and

instantly its "streams, rivers, ponds, and pools of water," namely, its canals, sluices, reservoirs, and wells, became corrupted like the colour of blood. This was done in the sight of Pharaoh and of his servants, who witnessed with astonishment the transformation—that "all the waters which were in the river were turned to blood"—and that "there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt." It is not certain whether this corruption of the water extended to the Land of Goshen. Josephus asserts that none of the plagues were felt by the Israelites, but Bryant, who is subsequently quoted, maintains the contrary.

As the real nature and intensity of the plagues of Egypt inflicted on this memorable occasion can only be appreciated by recollecting that Jehovah made the objects of religious worship the instruments of punishing a superstitious people, the amazement and terror of the Egyptians may be easily conceived at this unaccountable and mysterious transformation. Even at the present day the Egyptians cherish the greatest veneration for the Nile, although the sterner system of Mahometanism has long supplanted the ancient polytheism. They call it the *most holy river—most blessed, most sacred, and divine*; and the rites with which its benefits are celebrated evidently exhibit a tendency towards the same form of acknowledgment and gratitude as when in remote ages, and especially at the eventful time now before us, this river had its appointed priests, festivals, and sacrifices. It is to the Nile that Egypt owes not only its fertility but its existence, and we need not be therefore surprised that the feeling generally entertained by the ancient as well as by the modern Egyptians of their entire dependence upon the Nile induced them to deify the supposed invisible agent, or presiding spirit, or genius of the river, who caused its periodical inundation, for wherever the influence of that inundation is not felt the soil is sandy and arid, and the region is a desert. Very little rain falls in Egypt. In the country called Upper Egypt rain is scarcely known, and in Lower Egypt a

slight and almost momentary shower is all that is occasionally experienced during the cool part of the year. Early in July the rise of the river is rapid and perceptible, its greatest height is attained about the autumnal equinox, and the lowest point is reached in April following. Then it fills the vast number of trenches and canals cut throughout the whole extent of the country at incredible labour by the Egyptians, though these canals are not opened till the river has attained a certain height, nor yet all at the same time; and the distribution of the water is so distinctly and minutely regulated, that, according to the common statement, scarcely a tenth part of the water of the river reaches the sea during the first three months of the inundation. While the inundation lasts the whole level country appears like a series of lakes and reservoirs; and when the waters begin to subside, and the sluices are opened again in the autumn, to allow the waters to pass on to contribute to the irrigation of the Delta, the mould or sand brought down by the river contains principles so friendly to vegetation, that it is used as manure for those grounds which have not been adequately benefited by the inundation. As soon as the waters have retired the cultivation of the ground commences, and the labour of the agriculturist is light where the ground has been sufficiently saturated. The seed is sown in the moistened soil; vegetation and harvest follow with rapidity; wherever water can be commanded a succession of crops rewards the efforts of the cultivator, the Delta rejoices in luxuriant fertility, and the fields of Egypt, intersected by numerous canals and streams, as well as by the divisions of the river, extend in glowing freshness beneath a burning sun.

These descriptive remarks might easily be extended, but enough has been said to bring to the reader's recollection facts which he doubtless well knows, and remind him of the real nature of this plague—the consternation and terror with which the change in the appearance and quality of the water would be viewed by the

Egyptians. This plague, moreover, must have been inflicted during the subsiding of the periodical inundation, for we shall subsequently find that the seventh—the plague of hail—occurred in or about our month of February, and it has been already noticed that the Nile does not resume its lowest level until the month of April. Moses was commanded to say unto Aaron—“Take thy rod, and stretch out thine hand upon the waters of Egypt, upon their streams, upon their rivers, and upon their ponds, and upon all their pools of water, that they may become blood, and that there may be blood throughout all the land of Egypt, both in vessels of wood and in vessels of stone.” This last reference indicates those vessels in which water was kept in private houses for present use, and perhaps includes those filtering vessels through which they purified the water of the Nile for drinking. The particularity here employed in enumerating the various places which contained water deserves notice. It is previously noticed that the *rivers* mentioned mean the canals dug by the inhabitants, for there is only one river in Egypt; but we find the same word employed to express canals and arms of rivers in other parts of the inspired writings. In the 137th Psalm the Hebrew captives are represented as sitting and weeping at their own misfortunes and the desolate condition of their country by the *rivers of Babylon*, namely, the canals formed from the Euphrates at that great metropolis of ancient Oriental splendour. In Egypt there are reservoirs of water higher than the Nile, which are filled at the periodical inundation, and in these the water is preserved a long time, as in a kind of cistern. These reservoirs are of great antiquity, and were doubtless erected as early as the days of the Pharaohs.

Moses tells us that when “he did as the Lord commanded,” the “waters that were in the river were turned to blood,” and “there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt.” This probably means no more than that the water of the Nile became red like blood, for it is a com-

mon Hebrew form of speech to describe similarity by identity. This leads us to consider the statements urged by that class of commentators who are anxious to explain the miracles and great transactions recorded in the Scriptures on natural principles, and with the one before us they have been peculiarly unfortunate. When the Nile is rising the waters become of a brownish-red colour, sometimes they become green, and they have been known to become for a short time corrupt, during which the inhabitants use the water deposited at the annual inundation in their cisterns and reservoirs. These facts are attested by several travellers, and this brownish-red colour of the water at these periods, which is probably occasioned by the earth brought down by the river from Abyssinia, has been alleged as the discoloration mentioned by Moses. But to these and various other statements there are insuperable objections. It is to be observed that the text carefully distinguishes this miracle from any such natural occurrence, for we are expressly told that not only the waters of the river and its canals, but those more distant, and those already drawn for private use, partook of the general change. Even the reservoirs, which it is mentioned previously were, as they still are, higher than the level of the Nile when subsiding, and had no communication with it, became discoloured. But it is a fact well ascertained, that the water of the Nile, when subject to this natural red discoloration, is so far from being considered unwholesome by the Egyptians, that it is recognized as a sign of its becoming fit for use, as it immediately succeeds the greenish discoloration, during which the water is so unwholesome that they confine themselves to the water preserved in cisterns. Another refutation of the statement is grounded on the fact that the transaction now before us could not have happened later than our February, which is undeniable from what is stated respecting the state of the agricultural produce when the plague of hail

was inflicted, whereas the rise of the river, which is attended by this red discoloration, does not take place till *several months later*. It consequently follows that if the discoloration was natural the river must have risen at a most unusual season of the year; and when we consider the astonishing punctuality, even to a day, which has always marked the periods of increase and subsidence, it would be no less a miracle than the miraculous turning of the river into blood. Michaelis and others maintain the anticipatory rise of the river at the command of Moses rather than admit the supernatural discoloration, yet it is evident that nothing can be gained by this hypothesis. On this part of the interesting inquiry before us, the learned Bryant has some excellent historical and practical observations. "God might, if it had been the Divine pleasure, have in many different ways tainted and polluted the streams of Egypt, but he thought proper to change them into blood. Now the Egyptians, and especially their priests, were particularly nice and delicate in their outward habit and rites, and there was nothing which they abhorred more than blood. They seldom admitted any bloody sacrifices, and with the least stain of gore they would have thought themselves deeply polluted. Hence, this evil brought upon them must have been severely felt. The punishments then brought upon the Egyptians bore a strict analogy to their crime. They must have been greatly alarmed when they beheld their sacred stream defiled with blood, their land infected, and themselves almost poisoned with their nauseous deities. The evil reached the Land of Goshen, for it seemed proper that the Israelites should partake in it, that the impression might be the stronger upon their minds. The great reason for this part of the punishment was to give them a thorough disgust to this worship, that they might not afterwards relapse into idolatry. For it is to be observed, that as they were to be conducted to the Land of Canaan and the confines of Syria, there were

many nations in those parts among whom this worship was common."

But there are other intimations connected with the infliction of this plague which ought not to be unnoticed. Moses tells us that "the fish which was in the river died." Here, again, Bryant appropriately observes—"The offensive vapour from the waters must have been a great aggravation of the evil to people of such external purity as the Egyptians, who abhorred all animal corruption. And what the historian mentions concerning the fish is of consequence, for all the natives of the river were in some degree esteemed sacred. In many parts the people did not feed upon them. The priests, in particular, never tasted fish, and this on account of their reputed sanctity, for they were sometimes looked upon as sacred emblems, at other times worshipped as real deities." But these observations of Bryant must have a reference rather to the usages of certain classes and certain districts, than to the ancient Egyptians in general. It is observed by Diodorus Siculus that the Nile abounded with all manner of fish, and that a number of men were constantly employed in salting the fish caught in the lake dug by Moeris for exportation; and the food of many of the Egyptians, who abstained from eating most animals, consisted of the fruits of the earth and the fish of the rivers. It is repeatedly stated by Herodotus, who had ocular demonstration of the fact, that fish formed the principal subsistence of the Egyptians, and that they ate them either salted or dried in the sun without any other preparation—the salt they used being fossil salt, which they procured in the African deserts, for they abhorred sea salt, and every thing belonging to the sea. The priests, however, abstained from the fish of the Nile, if not from all other fish, and it is probable that fish directly from the Red Sea and the shores of Lower Egypt were not eaten by the Egyptians; but whether the priests did so because they considered the fish of the river sacred, as Clement of Alexan-

dria asserts, or too impure from their possible communication with the sea, which is the statement of Plutarch, it is impossible to determine. Le Bruyn is the only author of any consequence who alleges that there are few fish in the Nile; but the very reverse is the fact, as is proved by the concurrent testimony of all ancient and modern observers.

Moses farther informs us that by this dreadful plague the water of the Nile became so corrupted that the Egyptians could not drink it. To appreciate the intensity of this statement properly, it must be recollected that, as the Egyptians adored their river, which Diodorus truly observes was more serviceable to mankind in the early ages than perhaps any other river in the world, the water of the Nile was held in the highest estimation by them for its admirable qualities, which have been the themes of praise in ancient and modern times. Some writers assert that it never became impure, whether preserved at home or exported abroad; and the Egyptians are said to have put it into jars, and to have preserved it for three or more years, under the impression that, like wine, it became better the longer it was kept. The various accounts of its super-excellent qualities may be perhaps overstated; but the united testimony of all travellers sufficiently proves that the Nile water has some peculiarly agreeable qualities which render it delicious and refreshing. It is said that the natives excite thirst that they may drink the more of it; and they have a saying, that if Mahomet himself had drank it he would have desired to live for ever, to enjoy that which among waters, according to Maillet, is what champagne is among wines. When Moses, therefore, tells us that the Egyptians loathed the water of the river, he intimates to us that they hated that which was deservedly dearest to them, and which they most admired and worshipped.

This wonderful discoloration and corruption of the waters of the Nile induced the magicians to "do so with their enchantments,"—namely, they made an

appearance of the same change in some of the waters. "It may be conjectured," says Bishop Patrick, "that Moses did not in a moment change all the waters of the country, but only those of the river at first, and afterwards by degrees all the rest, when the magicians had tried their art upon some of them." This observation has some force, when we compare the extensive statement in the 19th verse with the limited one in the 20th verse of the 7th chapter of Exodus. But even though the objection should still be urged, it may be answered that the Egyptians by digging found water unaffected by the plague, and on it the magicians could operate. Moreover, "there is nothing," says the author of *Scripture Illustrated*, "contrary to possibility in supposing that they might so change the colour and appearance of water by mixture as to deceive the spectators, or might even substitute a red liquid which might pass for blood,—not to insist upon this, that they might procure and produce the very blood of animals." It appears that the magicians of Egypt thought Moses and Aaron of the same profession as themselves, and we accordingly find them imitating with some success this plague and the succeeding one of the frogs; but the difference was marked and convincing, for they did so "with their enchantments," that is, by their juggling tricks and acts of legerdemain, which were greatly practised among the ancient Egyptians, whereas Moses and Aaron, who acted apparently by a simple volition, were in reality the agents of a superior power. Besides, they never attempted any thing on a great scale till they first saw it done by Moses and Aaron; and they certainly never would have made such appalling experiments as the plagues which the intrepid Hebrews were ordered to inflict.

During the continuance of the plague "the Egyptians digged round about the river for water to drink." Here it is to be observed that the well-water of Egypt is detestable, and is consequently never used

by the inhabitants to quench their thirst, except in cases of extreme necessity. The unfortunate Egyptians, overtaken by this calamity, which the great mass of them did not understand, and which, for any thing they knew to the contrary, might long continue, were compelled to dig wells on the banks of the Nile, which was a work of great labour and uncertainty. It was also a work which they well knew would not reward them when they had successfully performed it, for they were aware that whatever water they procured would be unpleasant and unwholesome, and muddy and brackish in the extreme. This well-water is the only other water apart from the Nile which can be obtained in Egypt, and its unpleasant character is the more strongly appreciated when contrasted with that of the river, which Benjamin of Tudela describes as both drink and medicine, and Sanderson, in 1586-7, thought to be "the profitablest and wholesomest in the world, by being both bread and drink" to the Egyptians, "for," he quaintly observes, "bread there could be none without it"—alluding to the fertility and exuberant crops which the irrigation causes and raises—"it breedeth no manner of diseases in the body, as divers other waters do, and it hurteth not to drink thereof either troubled or clear."

It is probable that if the Egyptians had been aware that this and the other plagues were caused by the imperious obstinacy of their king, they would have risen in rebellion, and either compelled him to comply with the demand of Moses, or themselves expelled the Hebrews from their country; but it is not to be supposed that the mass of the people know what is transacted in a court, more especially in an Oriental one, where the sovereign is despotic, and often refuses to assign a reason to any one for his conduct. But the extraordinary circumstance connected with this plague is, that it made no impression on Pharaoh. He was a spectator of the whole, yet he retired to his palace without seriously considering the miracle, and the difference between it and the attempts of the magicians. This

willful neglect was in reality the cause of his heart being hardened, as are the hearts of all those, in whatever station or rank of life, who are solely bent on the gratification of their own perverse and imperious inclinations. The miracle of the discoloration and corruption of the Nile continued seven days before the plague was removed, and we may readily conjecture the joy which would be manifested by the Egyptians when they saw the water of their river restored to its wonted salubrity and agreeable character. What Volney says he witnessed in Egypt would then be enthusiastically exhibited. The natural partiality of the thirsty Mizraim would revive, and they would take long draughts of the restored water. The men would rush into it with delight, and mothers would be seen plunging their infants into the stream, from their belief that it had a divine virtue—"such," says Volney, "as the ancients attributed to every river."

But this agreeable emancipation from a direful calamity was of no long continuance, and was to be succeeded by a series of others equally scourging and unbearable. The Almighty Jehovah had determined to deliver the Hebrews, and he had resolved to do so at a cost the most fearful to their oppressors, and which would make his power known in a remarkable and unparalleled manner. Moses was again ordered to appear before Pharaoh, and to threaten him with the plague of frogs "on all his borders," if he refused to permit the Hebrews to depart. Here it ought to be noticed that this and some of the other plagues were threatened before they were inflicted, that Pharaoh might know that they did not happen by chance, and that he might prevent them if he pleased, by repentance and submission to the Divine commands. The plague of frogs, like that of the discoloration and corruption of the Nile, arose from their sacred river in which they so much confided, and of the excellence and sanctity of which they were so much persuaded. "The river," said Moses to Pharaoh, "shall bring forth frogs abundantly,

which shall go up and come into thine house, and into thy bed-chamber, and upon thy bed, and into the house of thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thine ovens, and into thy kneading-troughs." The mention of *ovens* in the threatened plague induces us to remind the reader that the Egyptian ovens were constructed in the ground, and were of an oval or circular form, on the top of which they prepared their food. The possibility of myriads of frogs getting into these places was of itself the greatest possible nuisance. But the frogs were also to choke up the Nile, which became a second time polluted, to the utter confusion of the Egyptians; they were to cover the land, to crawl upon their houses, couches, and vessels, and to infest persons of all ranks, from the prince to the slave. Pharaoh did refuse, and the plague was sent as Moses had announced. The frog of Egypt is the *rana punctata*, or dotted frog, so called from its ash colour, being dotted with green spots. Its feet are marked with transverse bands, and the toes are separated to half their length. This frog is comparatively rare in Europe. These animals are said to be still very abundant in the Nile and other waters of Egypt, and the narrative of Moses intimates that they were plentiful in his time, but the production of myriads of them in a perfect state was a complete proof of a superior power overruling the ordinary operations of nature. The miracle further consisted in giving an impulse to the animals, and inducing them to desert the cool waters for the dry land, the plains, and the cities, contrary to their natural haunts. They spread themselves over the country, intruding even into the most frequented and driest places—the most private apartments not being exempted from their visitation. This plague, like several of the others, consisted in giving an unexampled magnitude to one of the greatest nuisances of the country, and, as also in the other instances, the object of superstition became the instrument of punishment. The frog was one of the sacred animals of the Egyptians, but

whether an object of reverence or abhorrence has not been distinctly ascertained. "Thus much," observes Bryant, "is certain, that it was very consistent with Divine justice and wisdom to punish the Egyptians by what they either abominated or idly revered." The country was equally defiled, and the palaces and temples rendered hateful; and as every stream and lake were in a state of pollution, the inhabitants could not perform any lustrations, or cleanse themselves from the filth with which they were tainted.

The magicians imitated this plague "with their enchantments, and brought up frogs upon the land of Egypt." This was a singular instance of retributive justice, by causing their limited efforts to increase the intensity of the plague instead of attempting to diminish it. Dr Wells observes—"It is probable that Pharaoh afterwards ordered them to try their skill and power in removing or destroying the frogs which Moses had brought up, and that they were unable to do it, God hereby showing that they could do no more than he thought fit to permit them." This dreadful plague made an impression on Pharaoh for the first time. He no longer proudly demanded—"Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go." He called Moses and Aaron, and said—"Entreat the Lord, that he may take away the frogs from me, and from my people, and I will let the people go, that they may do sacrifice unto the Lord." He was thus brought to acknowledge that God had sent the plague, and that He alone was able to remove it. Moses replied—"Glory over me; when shall I entreat for thee, and for thy servants, and for thy people, to destroy the frogs from thee and thy houses, that they may remain in the river only?" This phrase, *Glory over me*, is rendered in the marginal reading, *Have this honour over me*, intimating to him that he might take the honour or privilege of appointing his own time for his deliverance, and that God,

as an encouragement to his obedience, would deliver him at the very time he mentioned. Pharaoh said, "To-morrow," or, as it is in the marginal reading, *Against to-morrow*. Moses replied—"Be it according to thy word, that thou mayest know there is none like unto the Lord our God. And the frogs shall depart from thee, and from thy houses, and from thy servants, and from thy people; they shall remain in the river only." The frogs disappeared at the time specified, for "the Lord did according to the word of Moses." The astonishing extent of this invasion of frogs is indicated by the immense heaps of their carcasses which ultimately corrupted the country. We are emphatically told that they "gathered them together upon heaps, and the land stank."

"But," says the inspired historian, who was the great agent in these wonderful transactions, "when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said." Moses and Aaron were now ordered to inflict the plague of lice—to "smite the dust of the land, that it may become lice throughout all the land of Egypt." It is remarkable that Pharaoh received no warning of this plague, and it appears to have been inflicted immediately after the removal of the frogs, because his breach of faith deserved a noted judgment. He had positively assured Moses on that occasion that he would allow the Israelites to depart, yet he deliberately resiled from his solemn promise, and returned to a worse state of resolute obstinacy after the visitation was removed than before. The plague of lice was on this account inflicted in a summary manner, and the dust of the ground became lice "upon man and upon beast." The magicians attempted to imitate this miracle, but "they could not," and they were forced to acknowledge in it the "finger of God."

The Septuagint translators, who lived in Egypt, understand the *lice* mentioned in this plague to be mosquito gnats, and their rendering is confirmed by Origen

and Jerome, and several modern commentators. It must, however, be acknowledged that the majority of interpreters agree with our translation; but whether we understand the Hebrew word to indicate the mosquito gnat, or the vermin literally rendered in our version, the harrowing and disgusting intensity of this plague is obvious. We are assured by travellers that of all insect plagues, the misery and irritation which the mosquito gnat occasions are most intolerable. These gnats are small, ash-coloured, with white spots on the articulation of the legs, and breed in moist-soils, especially in marshy grounds—the annual overflowing of the Nile rendering Egypt too favourable to their production. In that country they appear in immense swarms, and they are nowhere more voracious. Their activity, insatiable thirst for blood, and the power of their sting, are truly astonishing; and the painful sensation which their sting produces, the intolerable itching which ensues, and the combined torture resulting from the infliction of fresh stings while the former are still smarting, are as distressing to the mind as to the body. To secure sleep at night the inhabitants of the countries infested by these insects are obliged to shelter themselves under mosquito nets or curtains, and this precaution was used by the ancient Egyptians. If the mosquito gnats are objected to as the insects intimated in the text, because Egypt produces them in abundance, and the miraculous nature of the visitation is therefore weakened or overthrown, the same objection applies to lice, which abound in that country to such a degree, that it is difficult for the most cleanly persons to keep themselves wholly free from them. All travellers notice the prevalence of these disgusting vermin, and the objects exhibited in the cities and villages are truly distressing. Whatever reading we adopt, it is only necessary to conclude that the insects were produced in swarms astonishing even in Egypt, and at a season when they do not usually prevail. "The Egyptians," says Bryant, "affected great

external purity, and were very nice both in their persons and clothing. Uncommon care was taken that they might not harbour any vermin. They were particularly solicitous upon this head, thinking it would be a great profanation of the temple which they entered if any animalculæ of this sort were concealed in their garments. It would have been well if their worship had corresponded with their outward appearance, but, on the contrary, it seems to have been more foul and base than that of any other nation. Yet their rites were carried on with an appearance of outward purity, and a scrupulous show of cleanliness. The judgments, therefore, inflicted by the hand of Moses were directed against the prejudices of the Egyptians, and they were made to suffer for their false delicacy in placing the essence of religion in external cleanliness, to the omission of things of real weight. The present judgment was attended with such propriety in its direction, that the priests and magicians immediately perceived from what hand it came. The two preceding plagues had been antecedently mentioned to Pharaoh, and notice was given of the hand that would inflict them, but of this third plague there was no warning afforded, yet the application was too plain to be mistaken, and the magicians said, *This is the finger of God.*"

We are not informed how long this plague continued, but it had no effect on Pharaoh—his "heart was hardened, as the Lord had said." A Divine command was given to Moses to accost the king, and to declare to him the will of God as he was walking upon the banks of the Nile in the morning. The plague of flies was threatened and inflicted. In this translation the words *of flies* are printed in *italics*, which intimates that they are supplied, and that these words are not in the original. The Vulgate renders it *all sorts of flies*, which agrees with our rendering, *swarms of flies*; but we are left to conjecture what kind of fly is meant, or if indeed the plague consisted in flies. We are subsequently

told that the "land was corrupted by reason of the swarm *of flies*," which could hardly apply to any *fly*; and the Psalmist, in his Psalm on the plagues of Egypt, says that God sent "*divers swarms of flies* among them, which *devoured* them," Psal. lxxviii. 45—an act also inapplicable to the common fly. It is certain that flesh-flies or dog-flies are bold, troublesome, and venomous; but some think the Hebrew word means a mixture of different insects, as rendered in the Vulgate. Bruce conjectures that the insect called *zimb* is indicated; and he tells us that as soon as it appears, and its buzzing is heard, all the cattle forsake their food, and run wildly about the plains till they die, worn out with fatigue, fright, and hunger. The miseries endured by the Egyptians and other nations are evinced from the fact that they had deities whose especial province it was to protect them from these tormenters. "But," observes Bryant, "this is not all: these insects, however incredible it may appear, were in many places worshipped. This reverence seems to have been shown sometimes to prevent their being troublesome, at other times because they were esteemed sacred to the deities. Nor did they only show an idolatrous regard to flies in general: there was a deity styled *Deus Musca*, who was particularly worshipped under the characteristic of a fly." So great a scourge were these insects justly considered, that we read of towns near lakes and marshy grounds where they particularly prevailed being deserted by the inhabitants on their account, and important military undertakings relinquished. It is, however, to be observed, that the Egyptian beetle is now considered by many learned commentators to be indicated in the text; and this agrees with the *devouring* mentioned by the Psalmist. It is about the size of the common beetle, and its colour is also black. It is described as devouring every thing which comes in its way, clothes, books, and plants; and it does not hesitate to inflict severe bites on the human body. If moreover, we are to

understand that one grand object of these plagues was to chastise the Egyptians through their own idols, no insect could have been more fitly employed. Its precise place in their religious system is not accurately ascertained, but it was conspicuous among their objects of reverence or fear, and it frequently occurs in Egyptian painting and sculpture. There is a remarkable colossal figure of a beetle, of greenish-coloured granite, in the Egyptian Collection in the British Museum.

One extraordinary circumstance is recorded as connected with this plague, and as illustrative of the power of Jehovah. Moses was ordered to announce to Pharaoh the pleasure of his Divine Master—"I will sever in that day the land of Goshen in which my people dwell, that no swarms of *flies* shall be there, to the end thou mayest know that I am the Lord in the midst of the earth. And I will put a division between my people and thy people; to-morrow shall this sign be." As this is the first specific announcement of the exemption of the Israelites from the plagues, it is supposed that the first three judgments were experienced by them as well as by the Egyptians, to teach them that there was no illusion in these mighty operations, which perhaps they might have suspected if they had not seen, and felt, and sustained some share in the evils. Josephus, however, as formerly observed, asserts that the Israelites were exempted from the whole of them, and they certainly were spectators of this and the other plagues which followed. The observations of Bryant are important on this subject. He contends that they were involved in the three first plagues for the reasons already specified, and, "on the other hand, Pharaoh and his servants, when they saw God's people involved in the same calamities with themselves, might have fancied there was nothing particular in the judgments, and in consequence of it not so distinctly seen to whom they were directed. Hence the scope of Providence would have been defeated. It therefore pleased God in the plague of flies, and

in those which came after, to separate the land of his own people, and preserve them from these evils. The Israelites having experienced the former evils, must have been more intimately affected with this immunity with which they were distinguished; and they must in consequence of it have been more ready to follow their great leader, who was the immediate agent of Providence both to punish and to preserve." Bruce offers some remarks, which are worthy of attention:—"We cannot read the history of the plagues which God brought upon Pharaoh by the hands of Moses without stopping a moment to consider a singularity, a very principal one, which attended the plague of the fly. It was not till this time, and by means of this insect, that God said he would separate his people from the Egyptians; and it would seem that then a law was given to it which fixed the limits of its habitation. The land of Goshen was a land of pasture, not tilled or sown, because it was not overflowed by the Nile. But the land overflowed by the Nile is the black earth of the valley of Egypt, and it was here that God confined the flies, for He says it was to be a sign of this separation of the people, which He then made, that not one fly should be seen in the sand or pasture-ground of the Land of Goshen, and this kind of soil has ever since been the refuge of all cattle emigrating from the black earth to the lower part of Atbara."

The fly of Egypt seems to have been proverbial, and hence the expression of Isaiah, "The Lord shall hiss for the fly of Egypt." Pharaoh felt the intensity of this grievous plague, and hastily summoned Moses and Aaron to his presence. He gave them full permission to sacrifice to God where they were in the land of Goshen, from which we may infer that the Israelites had undergone a religious as well as a bodily persecution. But this offer Moses positively refused to accept. "It is not meet," he said, "to do so, for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God; lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they

not stone us?" The meaning of Moses here is, that it would not be safe in Egypt to sacrifice animals which the Egyptians worshipped. Herodotus expressly tells us that the Egyptians esteemed it a profanation to sacrifice any kind of cattle except swine, bulls, clean calves, and geese, and that heifers, rams, and goats, were held sacred either in one province or in another; and if his account of the early superstitions of Egypt approximate to accuracy, we may at once perceive the danger which the Israelites would incur by sacrificing "the abomination of the Egyptians." Many illustrations might be given of the just apprehensions of Moses from ancient and modern writers, but these would form too copious a digression. To express the feelings which existed among and was cherished by the ancient Egyptians on this subject in a single sentence, it may be stated that the punishment was death to kill a sacred animal designedly, and if undesignedly the amount and mode of punishment were left to be decided by the priests. As the Israelites could not plead the latter excuse as an alleviation, there can be no doubt that their rites would have exasperated the Egyptians to such a degree that a general massacre would have ensued. Diodorus relates a circumstance which occurred while he was in Egypt. Some Romans had proceeded thither to conclude a treaty, and as the Roman power was then held in great fear, the strangers were treated with respect and attention, but one of them happened accidentally to kill a cat, when the enraged mob hastened to his residence, loudly demanded vengeance, and nothing could deter them from putting him to death.

Whatever might have been the religious sentiments of Pharaoh, or of the dynasty of Shepherd Kings to which he belonged when they first invaded the country, it is certain from the narrative that they ultimately conformed to most of the peculiar usages, and probably to the religion, of the conquered; and this is farther proved by the fact that even the Israelites did not remain untainted

by the idolatry of Egypt. The answer of Moses, therefore, is precisely that which would have been given to a Shepherd king rather than to a native Egyptian prince. Moses, we have seen, rejected the offer, and persisted in his original request. "We will go three days' journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice to the Lord our God, as he shall command us." Pharaoh, to be delivered from the plague, reluctantly assented. "I will let you go, that ye may sacrifice to the Lord your God in the wilderness, only, ye shall not go very far away; entreat for me." He was apprehensive, like his predecessor, of their ultimate flight, or that they had some design never to return. Moses replied—"Behold I go out from thee, and I will entreat the Lord that the swarms of flies may depart from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people to-morrow, but let not Pharaoh deal deceitfully any more, in not letting the people go to sacrifice to the Lord." The plague was accordingly removed, and there "remained not one" of the insect tormentors; but the promises of Pharaoh were in this instance also false. No sooner was the scourge taken away than he became as unrelenting and perverse as ever. He "hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go."

A new calamity was now to be inflicted on the Egyptians, who were the unfortunate sufferers for the obstinacy of their king. This was the murrain, or disease of the cattle, of which Pharaoh received due notice from Moses. A particular tendency and meaning may be observed in this plague if we consider it with regard to the Egyptians, which would not have existed in respect to almost any other people. Some observations are already made on the subject of their sacred animals which illustrate this. "The hand of the Lord" fell upon "the horses, upon the asses, upon the camels, upon the oxen, and upon the sheep," and there was a "very grievous murrain." This judgment was accordingly most significant, in its execution and purport; for they not only suffered a severe

loss, but, what was to a superstitious people of more consequence, they saw the representatives of their deities, and even their deities themselves, involved in one common calamity. Hence the observation of the sacred historian, that "upon their gods also the Lord executed judgments." We are told that "all the cattle of Egypt died," which must be understood with some limitations, because we subsequently find that cattle are still threatened by the plague of hail. The meaning probably is, either that all in the fields, and not those under shelter, died, or that many of all sorts fell victims to the plague; and it is also possible that there were persons in Pharaoh's court better disposed than himself, who began to think seriously of the great transactions which they had already witnessed and experienced. Dr Hales conjectures that the Egyptians might have recruited their exhausted stock from Goshen, where "not one of the cattle of the children of Israel died," and farther observes—"This justifies the supposition that there was some respite or interval between the several plagues, so that the whole may have taken up about a quarter of a year. That the warning in this case was respected by many of the Egyptians, we may infer from the number of chariots and horsemen that afterwards went in pursuit of the Israelites."

But the infliction of this plague had no effect on the obstinate Pharaoh—his heart continued "hardened, and he did not let the people go." His conduct justly excited the indignation of Jehovah, and we find Moses commanded, without any further message to the king, to bring another judgment upon him and the Egyptians more alarming, and certainly more loathsome, than any of the preceding. In obedience to the divine injunction Moses and Aaron "took ashes of the furnace, and stood before Pharaoh, and Moses sprinkled it up toward heaven, and it became a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and upon beast; and the magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boils, for the boil

was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians."

There was something very significant in this plague which deserves a brief notice. The furnace from which the ashes were taken aptly represented what is elsewhere (Deut. iv. 20) termed the *iron furnace* of Egyptian bondage, and the scattering of the ashes in the air might refer to certain of their idolatrous and superstitious usages; while the ashes converted another of the objects of their veneration, the *air* or *æther*, into an instrument of punishment. Instead of the ashes which Moses and Aaron threw into the air, there came down a small sleet or dust, which scalded the flesh of man and beast, and raised a blister—"a boil breaking forth with blains"—in every part on which it fell. The Hebrew word properly signifies an inflammation, which first makes a tumour or boil, as we translate it, and then becomes a grievous ulcer. Moses subsequently speaks of it as an unusual plague, and calls it the *boil* of Egypt, Deut. xxviii. 27. Gesenius thinks that it means the elephantiasis, which has been generally considered as a stage or form of leprosy; and hence we find it noticed as one of the cutaneous disorders indicative of leprosy, of which the priests under the Law were ordered to take cognizance. "This plague," says Bryant, "like those which preceded it, was well calculated to confound the Egyptians, and confirm the faith of the Israelites. The Egyptians had many gods, and those of high rank, who were supposed to preside over pharmacy and medicine, and to these the people looked with great confidence in all those pains and maladies to which the human frame is subject. The Egyptians believed that the art of medicine was found out by these gods, and from them to have been transmitted to particular persons in succession, who under their influence carried it on to the advantage of the nation. Hence, in this instance, as in the preceding, the Egyptians were not only punished, but were shown the baseness of their worship, and the vanity

of their confidence, where they most trusted. They could dig for water, and in some degree shelter themselves from flies, but there was no resource from this evil, which was brought more home to them. It was a taint of the human frame, a grievous internal malady, under which the priests as well as the people smarted to their astonishment and confusion. Hence it appears that the prince of the country was deserted of his wise men, as well as of his gods—"the magicians could not stand before Moses, because of the boil, for the boil was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians."

The next visitation was the plague of hail, of which Pharaoh received due intimation. This hail is described as "very grievous, such as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now." Moses informs us that he "stretched forth his rod towards heaven, and the Lord sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along upon the ground, and the Lord rained hail upon the land of Egypt. And the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt all that was in the field, both man and beast, and the hail smote every herb of the field, and brake every tree of the field. Only in the Land of Goshen, where the children of Israel were, there was no hail." Yet in the midst of judgment God remembered mercy, and gave a gracious warning to the Egyptians to avoid, if they chose, the threatened calamity. "He that feared the word of the Lord among the servants of Pharaoh made his servants and his cattle flee into the houses; and he that regarded not the word of the Lord left his servants and his cattle in the field," where they were of course destroyed.

In some countries hail is a common production of the atmosphere, but in Egypt it is rare, because the sultriness of the climate does not permit its formation. Thunder and lightning are also very unfrequent in Egypt, and even when they occur, they are divested of the terrific qualities which they sometimes exhibit in other countries. The Egyptians

never associate the idea of destructive force with these phenomena, and are unable to comprehend how lightning can injure or occasion any alarm. The duration of this miracle is not the least remarkable. In ordinary instances hail-storms last a very short time in countries where they are common, but in Egypt, where hail rarely falls, and, when it does, with slight effect, it lasted long enough to terrify Pharaoh, and it brought more conviction for the time to the mind of the king than some others which we in a different climate would have thought likely to make a deeper impression on his stubborn disposition. In this tremendous plague the united elements of air, water, and fire, were employed to terrify and punish the Egyptians by their principal divinities, all jointly demonstrating and proclaiming that the God of the Hebrews was the Ruler of nature. In this wonderful miracle, therefore, we recognize a three-fold interference of Providence—first, that hail was formed—second, that it was to happen at a particular time, which no human power could achieve, for no such power can control the atmosphere—and, third, that in a certain district these occurrences did not take place.

Pharaoh was really terrified by the continuance of this fearful storm, and he sent for Moses and Aaron, to whom he made a confession which does not argue any religious tenderness of heart, but was extorted by his excessive alarm. "I have sinned this time," he said; "the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked. Entreat the Lord (for it is enough) that there be no more mighty thunderings and hail, and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer." In his admission of having sinned *this time* he does not mean that he had not sinned before, but he acknowledges his offence, and the justice of God in punishing the wickedness of himself and of his people. Moses informed him—"As soon as I am gone out of the city I will spread abroad my hands unto the Lord, and the thunder shall cease, neither shall there be any

more hail, that thou mayest know how that the earth is the Lord's. But as for thee and thy servants, I know that ye will not yet fear the Lord God." The plague was removed as Moses intimated—the hail ceased, the thunders subsided, and the sky of Egypt resumed its usual unclouded serenity, but the effect on Pharaoh was exactly what Moses foretold. He forgot his solemn promise, and refused to release the Israelites. He even purposely "hardened his heart," by stifling the dictates of conscience, and acting against conviction. "In this instance," says Dr Hales, "there is a remarkable suspension of the judicial infatuation. Pharaoh had humbled himself, and acknowledged his own and his people's guilt, and the justice of the divine plague. The Lord therefore forbore this time to harden his heart. But he abused the long-suffering of God and this additional respite; he *sinned yet more*, because he now *sinned wilfully*, after he had received information of the truth; he relapsed, and hardened his own heart a seventh time. He thus became a vessel of wrath fitted to destruction."

Moses informs us that "the flax and the barley were smitten, for the barley was in the ear, and the flax was bolled; but the wheat and the rie were not smitten, for they were not grown up." This interesting intimation enables us to ascertain the season of the year in which these important transactions took place. In Egypt flax is ripe in March, when the plants are gathered, and it must therefore have been *bolled*, or ripening to seed, in February, in which month this and several of the other miracles are understood to have been effected. It may be here noticed in passing, that by the expression, *the flax was bolled*, some think that the seeds or grain of the flax were assuming a *roundish* form within their husks. It is expressly stated in all works on Egypt that barley is gathered in before the wheat in that country, and as the wheat harvest takes place in May in Lower and in April in Upper Egypt, the barley must have been in ear in February, when

the wheat would be hardly grown up, at least not eared, but, being tender and flexible, would yield to the stroke of the hail, and receive less injury than the barley and flax, which were in a ripening state. Dr Richardson, who conjectures that the transaction took place in the early part of March, says—"The barley and flax [in Egypt] are now far advanced, the former is in the ear and the latter is bolled; and it seems to be about this season of the year that God brought the plague of thunder and hail upon the Egyptians, to punish the guilty Pharaoh, who had hardened his presumptuous heart against the miracles of Omnipotence." As to the *rie* mentioned by Moses, it is not clear what it denotes. The Hebrew word signifies a hairy plant, and it is supposed to be a species of corn. Dr Shaw thinks that the word may signify rice, and it is probable, from the intercourse of ancient Egypt with Babylon, that the ancient Egyptians were acquainted with a grain well suited to their climate and to the soil of their inundated country.

The next plague was the locusts. An invasion of these creatures is one of the most terrible judgments that can overtake an Eastern nation. Their depredations are most appalling, and they destroy in a few days the beautiful verdure of vast tracts of cultivated country. Their destructive ravages are so well known, or at least have been so often described, that any lengthened detail is here unnecessary. In the present instance the locusts are said to have been unlike any that were ever seen before or after in size and numbers. The narrative of Moses is most graphic, and illustrative of their appearance and habits. "And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and the Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day and all that night, and when it was morning the east wind brought the locusts. And the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt; and rested in all the coasts of Egypt, very grievous were they; before them there were no such locusts as they.

neither after them shall be such. For they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left; and there remained not any green thing in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Egypt." Though locusts are common in Arabia they are seldom found in Egypt—the Red Sea forming a barrier against them, as they are not formed for crossing seas or for long flights. The winds also blow there six months from the north and six months from the south, so that the strong easterly wind mentioned in the text, which enabled them to cross the Red Sea, has every appearance of being preternatural.

When Moses announced the infliction of this plague to Pharaoh, which he did in the strongest language, we are told that "Pharaoh's servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us? Let the men go, that they may serve the Lord their God; knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" This is certainly to be understood as applying to the conduct of Pharaoh rather than to that of Moses. The king's obstinacy had nearly ruined Egypt, and he now understood that his "servants" were not satisfied with his continued refusal to yield to the demand of the Israelites. We accordingly perceive the influence of this discovery upon his mind, in his reluctant willingness to allow the Israelites to depart on certain conditions after the plague was announced. He called Moses and Aaron, and said, "Go, serve the Lord your God; but who are they that shall go?" Moses replied—"We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we must hold a feast unto the Lord." Pharaoh answered in language one part of which may be understood either as a form of imprecation, or as a scoffing defiance. "Let the Lord be so with you, as I will let you go, and your little ones, look to it, for evil is before you. Not so;

go now ye that are men, and serve the Lord, for that ye did desire." After this declaration, which showed the wish of Pharaoh to detain some portion of their families and property as a security for their return, Moses and Aaron were driven from his presence, and the plague of the locusts was inflicted in the manner already noticed by the inspired historian.

But when Pharaoh saw the dreadful ravages which the locusts committed—that they devoured every leaf and blade of grass which had been left in the former devastation of the hail, and what was beginning to vegetate, he sent for the Hebrew leaders in haste, and implored them to entreat God that he would take away that *death* from him. He confessed his sin, and requested to be forgiven, declaring at the same time his willingness to let the people go. Although Moses placed no confidence in his promises, he "went out from Pharaoh, and entreated the Lord; and the Lord turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea: there remained not one locust in all the coasts of Egypt." The observations of travellers illustrate this statement. Strong winds are the only remedies to free a country from this plague; for if the locusts die in the fields, the air is so corrupted with the effluvia of their carcasses that pestilential diseases are certain to be the consequence. In the present instance the power of God appeared not less conspicuous in sweeping them all away than in bringing them upon the country, for both were done by the agency of Moses.

Pharaoh again forgot his promises and hardened his heart. The next plague—that of a "thick darkness over all the land of Egypt, even darkness which may be felt," and which continued three days, was ordered to be inflicted, but Pharaoh received no intimation of it; and we perceive Jehovah now proceeding to the execution of the sentence of utter destruction which he had decreed against the king. During the three days of darkness, the "Egyptians saw not one

another, neither rose any one from his place for three days ; but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." Some understand this as intimating a darkness such as obliges people to feel about for what they want, or to guide their movements ; and the expression, *darkness which may be felt*, is a strong poetical indication of a most intense darkness. Various opinions are entertained by expositors respecting the nature of this remarkable miracle. Some think the darkness was caused by thick and clammy fogs, which might be felt by the bare faces and hands of those who were exposed to them ; others state that "so thick, black, and dreadful a mist fell upon the country as affected all people in the most sensible manner, and with the most frightful apprehensions ;" and others, that the agency employed was a wind filling the air densely with particles of dust and sand, and consequently creating a great darkness,—such winds not being uncommon in the Eastern deserts, and at all times appalling, and often destructive in their effects. It is impossible to speak decidedly on this subject, but unquestionably a fog in such a climate as Egypt would fill the inhabitants with horror and apprehension, and it would be miraculous as it regards the country, because fogs are not known there. The consternation of the Egyptians is strongly represented by their total inaction—"neither rose any from his place for three days"—petrified as they were with horror. "This judgment," says Bryant, "was very extraordinary, nor had any thing similar been ever experienced by this or any other nation. It bore a strict analogy with the sentiments and idolatry of the people who suffered. The Egyptians were a people of great learning, and seem to have been superior in science to all other nations ; but they prostituted those noble gifts, and, through an affectation of mystery and refinement, they abused the knowledge afforded them ; for, by veiling every thing under a type, they at last lost sight of their original intelligence. They at first looked

upon light, and fire, and the great fountain of the sun, merely as proper emblems of the true Deity, the God of all purity and brightness ; but such was the reverence they paid to them, that in process of time they forgot the hand by which those things were framed, and looked upon the immediate means and support of life as the primary efficient cause, to the exclusion of the real Creator. What, then, could be more reasonable and apposite than for a people who had thus abused their intelligence and prostituted their faculties—who raised to themselves a god of day, their Osiris, and instead of that intellectual light, the wisdom of the Almighty, substituted a created and inanimate element as a just object of worship—what, I say, could be more apposite than for a people of this cast to be doomed to a judicial and temporary darkness ? The judgment bore a strict analogy with the superstitions ; and as it was a just punishment to them, so it was a proper warning to others not to give way to the like mystery and illusion. Nor was this all : As the Egyptians betrayed an undue reverence for the sun and light, so they showed a like veneration for night and darkness—regarding them as real, sensible, substantial beings, and giving them a creative power. They were therefore very justly condemned to undergo a palpable and coercive darkness, such as prevented all intercourse for three days. In short, they suffered a preternatural deprivation of light, which their luminary Osiris could not remedy ; and they were punished with that essential night which they so foolishly had imagined, and at last found realized."—"It appeared," says Dr Wells, "to have been caused by God, both to punish the Egyptians and to relieve the Israelites, who were probably preparing, during these three days, for their departure."—"The same prodigy," observes Dr Hales, "but of shorter continuance, attended our Lord's crucifixion, when there was darkness over all the land from the *sixth hour*, the time of his crucifixion, till the *ninth hour*, when he expired—emblem-

atical likewise of that mental darkness and destruction which awaited his murderers."

Pharaoh was filled with terror at this miracle; and, in an interview he held with Moses, he said, "Go ye, serve the Lord, only let your flocks and herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you." He was now willing to grant the request of Moses, rather than endure plagues greater than those which had been already inflicted; but when he required that the wives and children of the Israelites, or at least their cattle, should be retained as a pledge of their return, he perceived, from the reply of Moses, that it was the real purpose of the Israelites to escape beyond the reach of his tyranny. Moses replied, "Thou must give us [*into our hands*] also sacrifices and burnt-offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God. Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not be an hoof left behind, for thereof must we take to serve the Lord our God; and we know not with what we must serve the Lord, until we come thither." This answer seems to have greatly irritated Pharaoh. It induced him not only to relapse into his original obstinacy and to harden his heart, but to threaten Moses with death if he ever again appeared in his presence. "Get thee from me," said the enraged king; "take heed to thyself, see my face no more, for in the day that thou seest my face thou shalt die." Moses replied in the most undaunted manner to this declaration of the tyrant, "Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more."

The great crisis was now at hand, to which all these plagues were preparatory. Moses received the Divine communication—"Yet will I bring one plague more upon Pharaoh, and upon Egypt; afterwards he will let you go hence: when he shall let you go, he shall surely thrust you out hence altogether. Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man *borrow* of his neighbour, and every woman of her neighbour, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold." Some observa-

tions are already made on the word erroneously rendered *borrow*, peculiar to our version—the proper meaning of which is *to ask* or *demand*. It is evident that the Hebrews were instructed to take advantage of the consternation of the Egyptians at the death of the first-born, and to demand compensation for having been so long obliged to labour in their service without remuneration; and when the last fearful plague was inflicted, the Egyptians, in their anxiety to hasten the departure of the Israelites, and probably fearing some new calamity if they did not comply, were in no condition to refuse. The *jewels* mentioned do not mean jewellery in precious stones, but express generally any articles of superior value, whether for personal ornament or any other purpose.

Moses, speaking of himself, informs us that "the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people." This appears to be introduced to explain why Moses was never exposed to personal danger from Pharaoh and his advisers, although he had brought so many plagues upon them, and why the Egyptians were willing to grant the Israelites what they desired. There can be no doubt that after the infliction of the nine plagues Moses was held in great reverence both by his own people and by the Egyptians, as a person who had extraordinary power from God. He now announced to Pharaoh the last fatal and mortal plague, which was to be inflicted about midnight—the death of the first-born—that all the first-born in Egypt would die, "from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the first-born of the maid-servant that is behind the mill [namely, female slaves, who are generally employed about the hand-mills common in the East]; and all the first-born of beasts; and there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more." It is not clear, however, whether Moses made this announcement personally to

Pharaoh, or informed him of it by a messenger. He merely mentions that "he went out from Pharaoh in a great anger;" and from the threat of the king already noticed, and the recorded resolution of Moses that he would see Pharaoh's face no more, we may infer that he was denied admittance, and that he intimated the impending mortality in the precincts of the palace. And on a review of the series of plagues, we may well observe with Stackhouse, that "the gradual increase of these judgments is remarkable. The first four plagues were loathsome rather than fatal to the Egyptians. After that of the flies came the murrain, which chiefly spent its rage upon the cattle. The boils and blains reached both man and beast, though there was still a reserve of life. The hail and locusts extended in a great measure even to life itself—the first by an immediate stroke, and both in their consequences by destroying the fruits of the earth. That of darkness added consternation to their minds and lashes to their consciences; and when all this would not reclaim, at length came the decisive blow—first the cutting off of the first-born, and then the drowning of the incorrigible tyrant and all his host."—"The manifest purpose of Providence," says Bryant, "in these signs and judgments, was to punish the Egyptians by a series of evils, and this on two accounts. In the first place, because they were endowed with noble parts and great knowledge, which they prostituted to a shameful degree; and, secondly, because, after their nation had been preserved by one of the Israelitish family, they had, contrary to all right, and in defiance of original stipulations, enslaved the people to whom they had been so much indebted; and not contented with this, they had proceeded to murder their offspring, and to render the bondage of the people intolerable by a wanton exertion of power. It had been told that the family of Israelites collectively were esteemed as God's *first-born* (Exod. iv. 22), for from that family Christ was to proceed, who is the *first-born* of

every creature. God, therefore, said to them, 'Let my son go, that he may serve me; and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born.' But they heeded not this admonition, and hence those judgments came upon them which terminated in the death of the eldest in each family—a just retaliation for their cruelty and disobedience."

Before the immediate infliction of this harrowing calamity it was announced to Moses by Jehovah—"This month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you." At this time the Hebrews had no particular names for their months, and spoke of them as the *first*, the *second*, and so on, in the same manner as the phraseology of the modern religious society called Friends or Quakers. This month here noticed by Jehovah, which, in commemoration of the great deliverance from Egypt, was to begin the year of the Hebrews, was called *Abib*, or the *month of the young ears of corn*, or of the *new fruits*, and this was probably the Egyptian name of the month, for *Abib* signifies an ear of corn. It corresponds to part of our March and April, and was in after times called *Nisan* by the Hebrews, and was the first month of their holy year from this particular time, namely, the beginning of the sacred or ecclesiastical year, with respect to the holidays and festivals ordained to be observed by Jehovah. In this respect it differed from the month which commenced the civil year, and was reckoned the first month not only for civil purposes, but for the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee. This was the seventh month, or *Tisri*, which corresponds to part of our September and October. Moses was commanded to inform the Israelites—"This month shall be unto you the beginning of months." The meaning is, that it was to be so to the Israelites especially, and with a particular reference to their redemption from Egypt. Hence the obvious origin of the tradition among the Jews that, as they were eman-

culated from Egyptian bondage on the fifteenth day of the month called Abib and afterwards Nisan, they would on the same day be redeemed by their long promised Messiah; and it is a fact worthy of observation, that this tradition refers to the very time of the year that our blessed Saviour suffered for the redemption of the world.

It was on this memorable occasion, also, that the Passover was instituted, so remarkably typical of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ—the Lamb of God, “slain from the foundation of the world.” The Passover was one of the three principal festivals of the Jewish Church, commemorative of the deliverance from Egypt; and the analogy between the paschal sacrifice and the sufferings of our Saviour has been acknowledged from the earliest period of the Gospel. The subject of it was to be “a lamb without blemish, a male of the first year,” and was to be selected “from the sheep or from the goats;” but the lamb was commonly chosen. The reader is referred to the minute account given by Moses of the institution of this remarkably typical festival, in the 12th chapter of the Book of Exodus. The flesh of the paschal lamb was to be “roast with fire,” and eaten with bitter herbs, or literally *bitters*; and according to the Mishna and Maimonides, there were five sorts of bitter herbs or lattuces, with any one or all of which it might be eaten. It was not to be eaten raw, or “sodden at all with water;” and whatever remained of it uneaten was to be burnt. The Hebrews were, moreover, to eat it with their “loins girded,” as persons prepared for a journey; and when we recollect the long and loose dresses usually worn by the inhabitants of the East, which, though convenient for the postures of ease and repose, would form a serious obstruction in walking, or in any laborious exertion, we at once understand this and other notices in the Scriptures. They were also enjoined to have their “shoes on their feet” and their “staff in their hand”—all indicative of

preparations for a journey. “With regard to *doctrines*,” says Maimonides, “the Passover serves as a memorial of the miracles in Egypt, and to perpetuate the remembrance of them to future generations. In respect to *duties*, we learn from it that in prosperity we ought to remember our former adversity with constant thanksgivings to God for our deliverance; and that in eating unleavened bread and bitter herbs in the Passover, we ought to learn humility and meekness, recalling to mind the things which have happened unto us.”—“The reasons,” says the same Jewish authority, in another place, “for the peculiar statutes and customs of the Passover, such as, *that it was to be eaten merely roasted with fire—to be eaten in one house, and not to have a bone of it broken*, is evident and clear; for, as *unleavened bread* was used because of haste, so, for the same reason, also *roasted meat* was preferred, because there was not time for food to be daintily cooked and prepared, nor could they stay to break the bones and take away what in other cases was forbidden. The Law adduces this reason for these things, when it says (Exod. xii. 11), ‘Ye shall eat it in haste;’ for when persons are in haste, there is no opportunity for *breaking bones*, or for *sending flesh from one house to another* and waiting the return of the messenger, as all these things require time and leisure; and the cause of their being in haste was lest any one should be retarded so long as to be prevented from departing with the multitude, and should be intercepted and killed. These were also ordered to be always observed, that the memory of the Passover might be perpetuated according to what is said (Exod. xii. 24), ‘Ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever.’ The paschal lamb was to be eaten by a *certain number of persons*, that every one might seriously and diligently provide it for himself, and not trust to any friend or neighbour who might neglect it. The *uncircumcised* were forbidden to eat of it, for which

our Rabbins offer the following reason : ‘ They omitted the precept of circumcision during their long sojourning in Egypt, that they might be like the Egyptians when, therefore, the ordinance of the Passover was enjoined us, God annexed this condition to it, that no one should slay it until he had circumcised himself, and his sons and domestics, and then he might eat it. All circumcised themselves; and such was the number of the circumcised, that the blood of the circumcision was mingled with the blood of the Passover; and some vestiges of this we have in the Prophet (Ezek. xvi. 6), saying, ‘ And when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thy own blood,’ *i. e.* in the blood of the circumcision and in the blood of the Passover.’ ”

But as the consideration of this and other of the Mosaic institutions would extend the present article to an undue length, it is necessary to return to the narrative. In obedience to the Divine injunction Moses convened the elders of Israel, and thus addressed them :— “ Draw out and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the Passover. And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side-posts with the blood that is in the bason; and none of you shall go out at the door of his house until the morning. For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he sees the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side-posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you. And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever. And it shall come to pass, when ye be come to the land which the Lord will give you, according as he hath promised, that ye shall keep this service. And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord’s Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egypt-

tians, and delivered our houses.” The people listened to this address with that reverence which the solemn announcement demanded—they “ bowed the head and worshipped,” and separated to their respective houses, to do “ as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron.”

It was indeed an awful event, and one well calculated to make an indelible impression on the Hebrews and their descendants. The sentence of death had gone forth against all the first-born of every rank and station in Egypt, extending even to the irrational creation; and it was to be inflicted during the solemn silence of midnight, when the solitude would add to the alarm, and increase the horrors of the Egyptians. But, in order to appreciate properly the intensity of this unparalleled visitation of divine wrath and judgment, it must be recollected that the Egyptians, perhaps above all other nations, were most frantic in their grief—a circumstance noticed by several writers. “ When any person died in a family,” observes Bryant, “ all the relations, and all the friends of the deceased, co-operated in a scene of sorrow. The process was to quit the house, at which time the women, with their hair loose, and their bosoms bare, ran wild about the streets. The men likewise, with their apparel equally disordered, kept them company—all shrieking, and howling, and beating themselves, as they passed along. This was upon the decease of an individual; but when there was one dead in every family, every house must have been in a great measure vacated, and the streets quite filled with mourning. Hence we may be assured that those violent emotions were general, and at the same time shocking past all imagination. The suddenness of the stroke, and the immediate and universal cries of death at midnight—that particularly awful season, must have filled every soul with horror. It was therefore very truly said by the Prophet of God, ‘ There shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it before, nor shall be like it any more.’ ”

The first Passover was celebrated in the evening which preceded this dreadful midnight, or, as the Hebrew expresses it, *between the two evenings*; for among the Jews there was a former and a latter evening—the first commencing at noon as soon as the sun began to decline, and the second from sunset. The time, therefore—*between the two evenings*—when the Passover was slain, was about three in the afternoon, on the fourteenth day of the month Abib, otherwise Nisan, which, as already stated, corresponds to part of our March and April; and it ought never to be forgotten, in a narrative such as the present, that this was the very time of the day, month, and season of the year, when Christ, our true Passover, was sacrificed upon the cross for the sins of the world. The awful mortality followed, and the first-born of every family in Egypt died in an instant. Moses attempts no description of the scene which ensued; but the short notice he gives of it conveys more to the mind than the most eloquently written narrative could successfully illustrate, and leaves the imagination to conceive a scene of horror which it is almost impossible to describe. “And Pharaoh,” he says, “rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt, for there was *not a house where there was not one dead*.” It is unnecessary to add any thing to this emphatic statement. It was a fearful price to pay for their grievous oppression of the Israelites after all the plagues they had endured; no man could comfort another, for every one was too full of his own sorrow; and to add to the consternation, it was found that in every case the first-born had been selected as the victim. “The destroying angel,” observes Dr Graves, “selects from every family through the land of Egypt the single victim pointed out; and while with unerring hand he aims at this the shaft of death, it passes over every habitation of Jacob, marked with the sign appointed by the divine command. Do we not in all this discover the plain

operation of that Being who alone is the God of nature and the God of life, whose will controls every element, and directs every event?”

The proud heart of Pharaoh was subdued, and he was compelled to obey the will of God without reserve or limitation; but as this obedience was extorted, not free, and as it was the effect only of a slavish and servile fear, it did not, as will be immediately seen, continue long. He soon repented, if we may so express it, of his *repentance*—his conduct and his fate reminding us of the inspired proverb, “He that, being often reprovèd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.” He summoned Moses and Aaron before him that night, or rather early in the morning of the fifteenth day of the month Abib, while the shrieks of bereaved mothers and the lamentations of terrified fathers filled the air, and his own first-born lay dead before him, and said, “Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go, serve the Lord, as ye have said: also take your flocks and your herds, as he have said, and be gone”—adding, in a manner sufficiently expressive of his alarm, “and bless me also.” But how could he expect a blessing, whose tyranny, cruelty, and obstinacy, had been the causes of all the unhappy calamities inflicted on the Egyptians, and which had been consummated by this decisive blow? The other plagues, grievous as they were, might be, as they were, endured; but there was no resisting death, more especially when inflicted in such an astonishing manner, without any visible agency or cause—the famine, the pestilence, or the sword. The Egyptians, convinced that any farther attempt to detain the Hebrews would only subject them to a calamity still more dreadful than the one before their eyes, were “urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land; for they said, We be all dead men.” On the part of the Israelites no human force was exercised—no one either lifted the sword or

bent the bow ; but the proud Pharaoh is humbled, his people are terrified, and they are now as anxious for the instant departure of the Israelites, as they had previously resisted with obstinacy every divine warning to allow them to leave Egypt. Nor is this all ; for they *demand* from the Egyptians the just rewards due to their past unrequited labours—"silver, and gold, and jewels;" and the horror-struck oppressors grant every thing, as the homage due to the present superiority of the Israelites, and as the purchase of their immediate departure.

In the year B. C. 1491, according to the Hebrew chronology, Moses led the Israelites from Egypt in the manner which he himself narrates. They amounted to "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, beside children; and a mixed multitude went up also with them, and flocks, and herds, even very much cattle." In the beginning of the Book of Numbers we learn that this statement of the number of men applies to males above twenty years of age ; and if we adopt the well ascertained statistical fact respecting population, that the number of males above twenty years of age is as nearly as possible one-half that of the total number of males, the whole male population of the Israelites would amount to 1,200,000; and if we add an equal number for females of all ages, the whole population of both sexes and of all ages will amount to 2,400,000—an extraordinary increase, when we recollect that their stay in Egypt, from the time of Jacob's emigration thither, did not exceed two hundred and fifteen years, which can only be explained by a reference to the purposes of God, who designed that the Israelites should become a nation in Egypt. At the same time, several interpreters have contended that there must be an error in these numbers ; but as we find this reading in the Book of Exodus supported by a series of distinct enumerations in the first chapter of the Book of Numbers, which was at the commencement of only the second year of the departure from Egypt, the supposition of

the text being corrupted and the number exaggerated, is altogether untenable.

The Hebrews, under the guidance of Moses, journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, which was their first stage. As the word *Succoth* simply means *tents* or *booths*, probably nothing more is intended than a place where caravans were accustomed to encamp, or which was afterwards so called from the encampment of the Israelites on the present occasion. The position of Succoth with reference to Rameses and the district of Goshen cannot be exactly fixed ; but about twelve miles north-east from Cairo there is a place supposed to be the Succoth of Moses, at which there is a rather large lake called *Birket-el-Hadj*, or the *Pilgrims' Pool*, which receives its water from the Nile, and near which are several villages. Here Moses received various Divine injunctions relative to the observance of the Passover—the first-born were ordered to be sanctified to God, and the "firstlings of the beasts" were also set apart ; but all these could be redeemed. It appears that Jehovah claimed this dedication or appropriation to himself, not only by right of creation, but to make the Israelites remember his miraculous providence in sparing their first-born when those of the Egyptians were destroyed.

Before following Moses, and narrating the proceedings of Pharaoh, it is curious to notice what is preserved by ancient authors respecting the exodus of the Israelites. In almost every particular their accounts are different or the reverse of the Mosaic history ; but these traditions are so many strong evidences to the truth of the inspired record. Instead of the Israelites being oppressed, they are represented by the Egyptian priest Manetho as the oppressors, who took advantage of some disorders in the neighbouring country of Ethiopia, to unite with the Shepherds expelled by Tethmosis, who inhabited *Jerusalem*, and "treated the inhabitants with such barbarity, that those who witnessed their impieties believed that their joint sway was more execrable

than that which the Shepherds had formerly exercised alone. For they not only set fire to the cities and villages, but committed every kind of sacrilege, and destroyed the images of the gods, and roasted and fed upon those sacred animals that were worshipped; and having compelled the priests and prophets to kill and sacrifice them, they cast them naked out of the country. It is said also that the priest who ordained their polity and laws was by birth of Heliopolis, and his name *Osarsiph*, from Osiris the god of Heliopolis: but that when he went over to these people his name was changed, and he was called *Moses*." The same writer, as quoted by Josephus, again says—"After this Amenophis returned from Ethiopia with a great force, and Rampses also his son, with other forces, and encountering the Shepherds and the unclean people [whom Manetho represents to be the Israelites], they defeated them, and slew multitudes of them, and pursued them to the bounds of Syria."

Josephus cites Chæremon, another ancient writer, who composed a history of Egypt, and gives the same name as Manetho to the king (Amenophis), and his son Rampses or Ramesses. This king was rebuked in his dreams by Isis, because his temple had been overthrown in war; and being greatly troubled, he was informed by a certain sacred scribe that if he would clear Egypt of all polluted persons he would be delivered from these terrors. "He therefore collected two hundred and fifty thousand persons, and drove them out. Their leaders were *two scribes* called *Moses* and *Josephus*, the latter of whom was a sacred scribe; but their Egyptian names were—that of *Moses*, *Tisithen*—and that of *Josephus*, *Peteseeph*." In a fragment of Diodorus preserved by Photius, and beginning the account by the former of the Jewish War, we have a similar story of a concourse of foreigners of every nation dwelling in Egypt, "who were addicted to strange rites in their worship and sacrifices, so that in consequence the

due honours of the gods fell into disuse; whence the native inhabitants of the land inferred, that unless they removed them there would never be an end of their distresses. They immediately therefore expelled those foreigners." After noticing that, *as some say*, the "most illustrious and able" of them passed over into Greece, Diodorus proceeds—"But a large body of the people went forth into the country now called Judea, situated not far distant from Egypt, being altogether desert in those times. The leader of this colony was *Moses*, a man very remarkable for his great valour and wisdom. When he had taken possession of the land, among other cities he founded that called Jerusalem, which is now the most celebrated."

Another ancient writer named Polemo, in the first book of his Grecian Histories, says—"In the reign of Apis, the son of Pnoroneus, a part of the Egyptian army deserted from Egypt, and took up their habitation in that part of Syria which is called Palestine, nor far from Arabia; *these indeed were they who went out with Moses*." And Artabanus, supposed to have been an Alexandrian Jew, who wrote about a century before the Christian era, and the fragments of whose history which are preserved follow the Scriptures with some few variations and additions, says, that the Jews "*borrowed* of the Egyptians many vessels and no small quantity of raiment, and every variety of treasure, and passed over the branches of the river (Nile) towards Arabia, and upon the third days' march arrived at a convenient station upon the Red Sea." The Memphite and Heliopolitan traditions respecting Moses and the passage of the Red Sea, cited by Eusebius, as well as those from Lysimachus, cited by Josephus, are subsequently noticed, and are worthy of notice as existing in very early times, though the authority of the former is very much to be suspected. These are curious illustrations of the great events now before us, and however much they differ in details or are contrary to the facts, they are so many corroborative evidences of the

real and genuine narrative given by Moses.

We are told by the inspired historian, the great leader in this wonderful emigration, that "it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt. But God led the people about, through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea; and the children of Israel went up harnessed [or, *by five in a rank*] out of the Land of Egypt." To understand this properly, it must be noticed that on leaving Egypt, as Palestine was the point to which the journey ultimately tended, the alternatives of Moses were either to cross the arm of the Red Sea, called the isthmus of Suez, and take a course north-east to Palestine, or to strike south-east into the Desert. But at the very outset there was a deviation from the regular track, the reason for which is assigned by Moses in the passage above quoted. That regular route was towards Gaza and the other cities of Palestine, which were a portion of Canaan, and at no great distance from the borders of Lower Egypt. "God would not permit them," observes an author, "to take this course, though compendious and easy, for He knew their refractory spirit, and how prone they were to disobey; and the proximity of this country would induce them on the first difficulty to return; of this we may be assured from what they did when (Exod. xvi. 3; Numb. xiv. 2) upon some disappointment they gave vent to their evil wishes." Besides, the nearest portion of the country to which the emigrating journey tended was occupied by the Philistines, a warlike people, nearly allied to those very Shepherds who had oppressed them in Egypt. It was not to be expected that they and the other tribes would resign their possessions in Canaan without a struggle, and if the Israelites had marched directly towards the Promised Land, an immediate war

must have been the consequence. But the Israelites were in no condition for war, and Jehovah had made other arrangements to fulfil the purposes of his providence. Moses was indeed at the head of six hundred thousand men, besides women and children, but this immense concourse was an undisciplined crowd, dispirited by bondage. Each of the alternatives—by the Gulf of Suez, or south-east into the desert, already mentioned—had its peculiar difficulties, but it is obvious, from a careful consideration of the subject, that the course taken by Moses at once indicates that he was no self-appointed-lawgiver, and that in this and other instances he was acting under Divine influence and control.

After leaving Succoth, where the Israelites encamped one day, Moses led them to Etham "in the edge of the Wilderness." This is supposed to be the present Adjerood, the third stage of the pilgrim-caravan, where there is a poor village with a well of bitter water, and an old fortress garrisoned by some Egyptian soldiers. It is situated at the northern extremity of the Gulf of Suez, a little inland, but if the Gulf extended, as it is supposed to have done, between twenty and thirty miles more to the north than at present, Etham must have been the like distance from the modern Adjerood. It is unnecessary, however, in a biographical sketch to enter minutely into geographical investigations, and we therefore follow Moses in the important transactions he records. The original request of the Israelites was to go "three days' journey into the wilderness to offer sacrifice," and this had been granted after a series of unexampled inflictions of Divine power and vengeance. The Israelites having arrived at Etham, "or the edge of the Wilderness," which they had reached after three days' journey from the banks of the Nile, were now at or near the spot which, according to the terms of their application, was to form the limit of their journey. At this spot, moreover, they were comparatively secure, and had little to fear from the Egyptians, for they

were ready to plunge into the desert if attacked, where no army could subsist without water. The proceedings at Etham were consequently decisive of the undertaking. There were only three alternatives which Moses could adopt at Etham—either to take the north-east course to Palestine, to proceed south-east into the desert, or to perform the sacrifices and return to Egypt, for we are expressly told that he was divinely prohibited from taking the regular route by way of Gaza—"God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, *although that was near*; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt." The move from Etham was in reality the crisis of the undertaking, and was obviously so regarded by Pharaoh, who no sooner heard of a further movement than he commenced the pursuit. He had kept a strict watch on the proceedings of the Israelites, and he evidently held himself in readiness to act according to the intentions they should indicate after the expiry of the three days' journey.

While at Etham Moses received the command of Jehovah to change the route of the Israelites, and instead of proceeding from that place round the head of the Gulf of Suez, and coasting along its eastern shore in the peninsula of Sinai, they were ordered to turn southwards along the western shore of the Gulf, to "encamp before Pi-ha-hiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon: before it shall ye encamp, for Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, They are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in. And I will harden Pharaoh's heart that he shall follow after them; and I will be honoured upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host, that the Egyptians may know that I am the Lord." Moses was ordered to encamp in the valley of Bedea, where there is an opening in the great chain of mountains which line the western coast called *Pi-ha-hiroth*, or; *the mouth of the ridge*, and *Migdol*, the castle, or garrison, opposite

Baal-zephon, probably a temple built for mariners; and he was literally "entangled in the land," for he was "shut in by the wilderness" on his rear and flank, and by the Gulf of Suez in front. This move is most unaccountable on any human principle of action, and as it involved the most certain destruction of the Israelites, neither Moses nor any other person would have taken such a step if acting on his own conclusions. It left them no other way of pursuing their journey than by that miraculous passage through the Red Sea which actually took place. It is clear that Moses was in this remarkable instance acting under the Divine influence, and, what it is of consequence to observe, the Israelites believed that he did so. They were not a people easy to lead, and we have repeated proofs that they did not place that confidence in Moses to which he was entitled. If the Divine command had not been clear to them they would assuredly have rebelled, as they did on other occasions, but the order was explicit, and they saw that it was their wisdom to follow the Divine indication. They had recently witnessed the wonders of Jehovah in Egypt, and they had another infallible and convincing proof of the Divine protection—"the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and by night. He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people." This cloud was a symbol of his gracious presence with and special providence over them. Here, as Bishop Patrick justly observes, we are not to understand that God himself moved from place to place, for He is every where present, but this cloud was moved by Him, from whom it came, as a token or sign that he was with them by his special favour wherever it went. "From the time that the children of Israel arrived at Succoth," says Shuckford, "to their passing the Red Sea into Midian, it does not appear that Moses led them

one step by his own conduct or contrivance. According to his narration of their several movements, it was in no wise left to his judgment where to lead the people, but their journeying was evidently conducted by the immediate direction of God, with a view to that miraculous deliverance which he designed for them at the Red Sea."

As soon as Pharaoh's spies informed him that Moses, instead of returning to Egypt at the expiry of the three days, had marched in a southern direction, having the Gulf of Suez on his left hand, he saw at once that they intended to elude his domination. He speedily drew together his army from the Delta, and, pursuing the Hebrews by forced marches, he came up with their encampment. His army consisted of "six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them." The most ancient chariots of war of which we read are those of Pharaoh on the present occasion, but we have a proof of the early existence of wheel carriages in Egypt from the notice taken of the "waggons" sent by Joseph to convey his father thither. Pharaoh had likewise an array of horsemen, and it is clear that a people like the Israelites, wholly unaccustomed to arms, were unable to contend with such a military force led by the king in person. As soon as the Egyptian army was recognized by the Israelites they "were sore afraid." Destruction appeared to them inevitable, and they probably expected no mercy from their oppressors on account of the plagues, and especially the death of the first-born, of which the Egyptians accused them of being the cause, and which they had resolved to revenge. They assailed Moses in the most sarcastic, reproachful, and enraged manner. "Because there were no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness? Wherefore hast thou dealt thus with us, to carry us forth out of Egypt? Is not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians? For it had

been better for us to serve the Egyptians, than that we should die in the wilderness." This disposition which they manifested to submit without resistance to their oppressors rather than expose themselves to new and unknown dangers, justifies the wise precaution of Divine Providence in preventing any encounter with the Philistines when they were depressed and debased by bondage. Moses had, humanly speaking, evinced unparalleled imprudence in exposing his host to inevitable danger by leading them into a defile, with mountains on either side, and the sea in front, yet the confident language in which he replied to those charges was equally remarkable. "Fear ye not," he said; "stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will show to you to-day, for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day [*or whereas ye have seen the Egyptians to-day*], ye shall see them again no more for ever. The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace." The extraordinary event which followed is very minutely narrated by Moses, *Exod. xiv. 15-31*, and to it the reader is referred. The reason of the strange and unaccountable move from Etham to the rocky defile before Pi-ha-hiroth, between Migdol and the sea, is at once developed. It was to give Pharaoh an additional inducement to follow them to his own destruction, by his knowledge of the advantage their position would give him in an attack upon them. The overthrow of the Egyptian host was therefore the contemplated result of the move from Etham to the place where they were to receive their complete and final punishment.

A remarkable circumstance preceded the passage of the Red Sea, which must have made a strong impression on the Israelites. The inspired historian informs us that "the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them; and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel, and it was a cloud of

darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night *to these*, so that the one came not near the other all the night." The great event now took place. In obedience to the Divine injunction Moses lifted up his rod, and stretched his hand over the gulf, and "the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided; and the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left." As some hours must have elapsed before the whole Hebrew host could pass through the miraculously divided gulf, we see at once the purport of the removing and reversing of the pillar of the cloud, interposing it between the Israelites and the Egyptians. The sea still continued divided, and the Egyptians, who saw the passage clear, and the Israelites congregated on the opposite shore, rushed in with their chariots and horsemen to follow up the pursuit. We are told that God "troubled the host of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily," or, as it is in the marginal reading, *made them to go heavily*; and Bryant writes on this statement—"It is probable that when the Egyptians were thus troubled and disordered, they did not follow the regular way of those whom they pursued, but got among the rocks and mud, and those other impediments with which the Red Sea particularly abounds. These brake their wheels and disabled their chariots, so that they made little way." The Egyptians, now alarmed at their danger, saw the folly of continuing the pursuit, and were compelled to acknowledge the power of Jehovah. "Let us flee," they exclaimed, "from the face of Israel, for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians." But in vain did they attempt to retrieve their rash adventure. Moses, by the command of Jehovah, stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the "sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared." The waters rushed into the divided chan-

nel on both sides: the Egyptian host were overwhelmed in that awful rushing of the deep into its wonted channel—there "remained not so much as one of them;" and "Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea shore." We are farther emphatically told that "Israel saw that great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians; and the people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses."

Such was the great, the illustrious, and the miraculous event which delivered the Israelites from their oppressors, and consummated the punishment of the Egyptians. The report of this and the other miracles in Egypt contributed greatly to facilitate the conquest of Canaan, by filling the minds of the neighbouring nations and tribes with apprehensions which they would not otherwise have entertained. This was forcibly expressed by Rahab at Jericho to the Hebrew spies in the next generation—"As soon as we heard these things our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man." We have also seen that it had its due effect upon the Israelites themselves, for when they saw the "great work" which the Lord had done, they believed in him; and in subsequent times, their historians, poets, and prophets, more frequently referred to this miracle than to any of the other manifestations of Divine power connected with their nation. It was on the occasion of this memorable deliverance that Moses composed a song of thanksgiving, which he and the Israelites sang to Jehovah. "I will sing unto the Lord," exclaimed the exulting and grateful Hebrew leader, "for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea." His sister Miriam, who is called a *prophetess*, from having the gift of composing hymns in praise of the Divine Majesty, "took a timbrel in her hand," as was the custom in after times when the Israelites prophesied, sang hymns, or celebrated any public rejoicing. The Hebrew women accompanied her "with timbrels and with

dances," and responded to the lofty invitation of Moses, the man of God, "Sing ye," or rather, "Let *us* sing to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously"—thus repeating the burden of the song of Moses, answering the people verse by verse, or after every verse sung by Moses and the men, Miriam and the women repeated this verse in the way of chorus. But the song of Moses on this memorable occasion is, as Dr Hales observes, also a sublime prophecy, foretelling the powerful effect of this tremendous judgment on the neighbouring nations of Edom, Moab, and Canaan—the future settlement of the Israelites in the Promised Land—the erection of the Temple on Mount Zion—and the perpetuity of the dominion and worship of God. "The most ancient of all poems now extant," says Bishop Lowth, "at least of those the age of which has been ascertained, is this thanksgiving ode of Moses after the passage of the Red Sea: it is at the same time most perfect in its kind. It shows the early connection which subsisted between poetry and religion; and is an example of that species of poetical composition which the Hebrews cultivated more than all other sorts, and in which they particularly excelled—namely, the rendering of public thanks in songs of triumph to God, for prosperity in their enterprises, and for success in war."

Before noticing the traditions preserved by ancient authors respecting Moses and the passage of the Red Sea, the following remarks from a truly elaborate, learned, and interesting work, are submitted to the reader. The work alluded to is entitled, "Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, including their Private Life, Government, Laws, Arts, Manufactures, Religion, and Early History, derived from a comparison of the Paintings, Sculptures, and Monuments still existing, with the Accounts of Ancient Authors. By J. G. Wilkinson, F.R.S.," &c. (three vols. 8vo, 1837). Mr Wilkinson informs us that Moses was born in the reign of Amunoph I., the successor of Amosis, the leader of the

eighteenth Diospolite dynasty; that the flight of the Hebrew lawgiver must have taken place in the second year of Thothmes I., and his return to Egypt after the death of this and the succeeding prince. The learned author farther states that Thothmes III. is the Pharaoh of the celebrated plagues, and he describes him as "a prince who aspired to the merit of benefiting his country by an unbounded encouragement of the arts of peace and of war. It was in the fourth year of his reign that I suppose the exodus of the Israelites to have taken place; and the wars he undertook, and the monuments he erected, must date subsequently to that event." Mr Wilkinson says in a note, that "we find the date of his *thirty-fourth* year on the monuments," and proceeds—"Indeed, there is no authority in the writings of Moses for supposing that Pharaoh was drowned in the Red Sea, and from our finding that wherever any fact is mentioned in the Bible history we do not find any thing on the monuments which tends to contradict it, we may conclude that these two authorities will not here be at variance with each other. And in order to show that in this instance the same agreement exists between them, and to prevent a vulgar error, perpetuated by constant repetition, from being brought forward to impugn the accuracy of the Jewish historian, it is a pleasing duty to examine the account in the Book of Exodus. According to it Pharaoh led his army in pursuit of the fugitives, and overtook the Israelites *encamping by the sea beside Pi-ha-hiroth, before Baal-zephon*. The Israelites having entered the channel of the sea, the army of Pharaoh, his *chariots and horsemen*, pursued them, and all those who went in after them were overwhelmed by the returning waters. This, however, is confined to the *chariots, and the horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh, that came into the sea after them*, and neither here, nor in the Song which Moses sang on the occasion of their deliverance, is *any mention made of the king's death*—an event of *sufficient* consequence at least

to have been *noticed*, and one which would not have been omitted. The authority of a Psalm (Psal. cxxxvi. 15) can scarcely be opposed to that of Moses, even were the death of Pharaoh positively asserted, but this cannot even be argued from the expression, *he overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea*, since the death of the monarch is not the necessary consequence of his defeat and overthrow." Proceeding on this hypothesis, Mr Wilkinson farther informs us—"The departure of the Israelites enabled Thothmes to continue the war with the northern nations with greater security and success, and it is not impossible that its less urgent prosecution after the time of Amun-m-gori II. was partly owing to the sojourn of the Jews in Egypt. At all events, we find evidence of its having been carried on by this monarch (Thothmes) with more than usual rigour, and in consequence of the encouragement given to the arts of peace, the records of his successes, sculptured on the monuments he erected, have been preserved to the present day. He founded numerous buildings in Upper and Lower Egypt, and in those parts of Ethiopia into which his arms had penetrated; he made extensive additions to the temples of Thebes; and Coptos, Memphis, Heliopolis, and other cities in different parts of the country were benefited by his zeal for architectural improvements. In many of the monuments he founded [several obelisks were cut by his order, as the two now at Alexandria, others at Rome, and one at Constantinople], the style is pure and elegant; but in the reversed capitals and cornices of a columnar hall behind the granite sanctuary at Karnak, he has evinced a love of change consistent neither with elegance nor utility, leaving a lasting monument of his caprice, the more remarkable, as he has elsewhere given proofs of superior taste. After a reign of thirty-nine years he was succeeded by his son Amunoph II., who, besides some additions to the great pile of Karnak, founded the small temple of Amada in Nubia, which was com-

pleted by his son and successor Thothmes IV. The great Sphinx at the Pyramids also bears the sculptures of the son of Amunoth, but whether it was commenced by him or by the third Thothmes is a question which it would be curious to ascertain. At all events, the similarity of the names may have given rise to the error of Pliny, who considers it the sepulchre of Amasis."

This account of the Pharaoh with whom Moses had so many momentous transactions and important interviews is not without interest, and every inquiry which tends to throw light on the perplexed and obscure events of ancient history is valuable and worthy of attention. But while there is a possibility that the above narrative is correct, and that Pharaoh was *not* drowned in the Red Sea, it must be confessed that it is far from convincing, and we are inclined to adhere to the universal belief, notwithstanding its "constant repetition," that the king was really overwhelmed with his captains and his horsemen by the returning waters. It is admitted that he led the pursuit in person to the shores of the Red Sea, and why should he not enter the miraculously divided Gulf as well as his army? It is certain that the Psalmist *does* expressly state the fact, for what can be more conclusive than the declaration that God "*overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea?*" As both Moses and the Psalmist were equally inspired, and wrote under the influence and by the guidance of the Divine Spirit, it follows that both are of equal authority, and if the Psalmist states a fact which Moses intends to be inferred, it is entitled to the same credit for undoubted authenticity. It has already been stated that the kings who oppressed the Israelites cannot now be identified, but all writers on the subject of the exodus of the Israelites have understood that Pharaoh was actually drowned in the Red Sea. After commanding Moses to march from Etham, and encamp before Pi-ha-hiroth, between Migdol and the Gulf, Jehovah announced to him—"I will harden

Pharaoh's heart, and *he shall follow after them*, and I will be honoured *upon Pharaoh* and upon his host, that the Egyptians may know that I am the Lord." And again, in the command to Moses to "lift his rod, and stretch out his hand over the sea, and divide it," the great Jehovah says—"I will get me *honour upon Pharaoh*, and upon all his host, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen." Nothing can be clearer from these solemn statements than that the tyrant was involved in the destruction of his army, which was the consummation of that series of punishments inflicted upon him for his obstinacy, injustice, and oppression. Still, such inquiries as those of the author now quoted are of consequence. They lead to a stricter investigation of facts, and tend to confirm the truth of the history. Mr Wilkinson has an observation as the result of his investigations which ought for ever to silence the clamours and assertions of sceptics, and others who are inclined to adopt their opinions, and one which is most satisfactory to all who believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures. "*Wherever*," he says, "*any fact is mentioned in the Bible history, we do not find any thing in the monuments which tends to contradict it.*"

It would be tedious to enter here into any examination of the exact part of that arm of the Red Sea called the Gulf of Suez, which was miraculously divided for the passage of the Israelites, and indeed it is next to impossible to ascertain the geographical position. It is generally admitted that this arm of the Red Sea anciently extended considerably northward of the present town of Suez, at the head of the Gulf, and there is nothing in the appearance of the soil about the isthmus of Suez to discountenance the hypothesis that the Red Sea was formerly no other than a strait uniting the Mediterranean with the Indian Ocean, and that the isthmus which is now interposed was formed by drifts of sand from the adjoining deserts. But that the Gulf of Suez, at present about one hundred and sixty

miles in length, with a mean breadth of about thirty miles, narrowing very much at its northern extremity, was formerly much more extensive and deeper than now, is proved by the fact that cities formerly mentioned as sea ports, as Kolsoum, are now considerably inland; and this fact is of the greatest importance, because it undeniably proves that nothing less than the power of Jehovah could enable the Israelites to cross the Gulf in the manner they did, even at the highest of the points selected by those who wish to detract from the miracle, or to account for it on natural principles. Professor Jahn, speaking of the place where the Israelites crossed, below Suez, says, "God again interposed, as he had so often done in Egypt, and by night opened a way for his people through the sea. At this place the sea is now one thousand five hundred paces broad, and has a sand-bank running across to the opposite shore, but at that time it must have been above two thousand paces broad, and much deeper than it is in the present day." This, however, is a mere conjecture. It is impossible to indicate any particular locality, because we do not know how far the Gulf reached to the north, and Niebuhr informs us that all the inhabitants of the coast claim the place of the passage for their own neighbourhood—that whenever a traveller makes inquiries on the subject, he is told that the Israelites passed the sea at the very point the question is asked. Eusebius relates, after ancient traditions, that the miraculous passage was made at Clyma, which is probably one of the Arabian traditions which fixes the transaction at Kolsoum, both places being considered identical. It is generally asserted by the Arabian and Egyptian traditions, that the passage was effected from the valley and bay of Bedea, and travellers assert that no body of men could be more effectually shut in than in this locality. The modern names of places tend to confirm this supposition. The Gulf of Suez is often called the *Bahr al Kolsoum*, or the *Gulf of Submersion*. The chain of mountains which line the western coast

of the Red Sea is called *Attaka*, or *de-liverance*. On the eastern coast opposite is a headland called *Ras-Mousa*, or the *Cape of Moses*, and in its neighbourhood is the large bay called *Birket Faroun*, or *Pharaoh's Pool*. The waters of this bay are in continual commotion, which the natives think to be occasioned by the unquiet spirits of the drowned.

It is unnecessary to enter into any refutation of the statements of those who attempt to account for the miracle on natural principles. The observations of Bruce on this subject are excellent:—"These doubts," he says, "do not merit any attention to solve them. This passage is told us by Scripture to be a *miraculous* one, and if so, we have nothing to do with *natural* causes. If we do not believe Moses, we need not believe the transaction at all, seeing that it is from his authority we derive it. If we believe in God, that He *made* the sea, we must believe that He could *divide* it when He saw proper reason, and of that He must be the only Judge. It is no greater miracle to divide the Red Sea than to divide the river Jordan."

Josephus and Eusebius preserve two accounts of the passage of the Red Sea from ancient authors, which are worthy of notice, though utterly at variance with the facts. The former historian quotes from Lysimachus, who says, that "in the reign of Bocchoris, king of Egypt, the Jewish people being infected with leprosy, scurvy, and sundry other diseases, took shelter in the temples, where they begged for food, and that, in consequence of the vast numbers of persons who were seized with the complaint, there became a scarcity in Egypt. Upon this Bocchoris, the king of the Egyptians, sent persons to inquire of the Oracle of Ammon respecting the sterility, and the god directed him to cleanse the temples of all polluted and impious men, and cast them into the desert, but to drown those that were affected with the leprosy and scurvy, inasmuch as their existence was displeasing to the Sun; then to purify the temples, upon which the land would re-

cover its fertility. When Bocchoris had received the oracle, he assembled the priests and attendants of the altars, and commanded them to gather together all the unclean persons and deliver them over to the soldiers, to lead them forth into the desert, but to wrap the lepers in sheets of lead, and cast them into the sea. After they had drowned those afflicted with the leprosy and scurvy, they collected the rest, and left them to perish in the Desert. But they took counsel among themselves, and when night came on lighted up fires and torches to defend themselves, and fasted all the next day, to propitiate the gods to save them. Upon the following day, a certain man called *Moyse*s counselled them to persevere in following one direct way till they should arrive at habitable places, and enjoined them to hold no friendly communication with men, neither to follow those things which men esteemed good, but such as were considered evil, and to overthrow the temples and altars of the gods as often as they should happen with them. When they had assented to these proposals, they continued their journey through the desert, acting upon those rules; and after severe hardships they at length arrived in a habitable country, where, having inflicted every kind of injury upon the inhabitants, plundering and burning the temples, they came at length to the land which is now called Judea, and founded a city, and settled there."

The reader will perceive various real events in the history of the Israelites all grouped together in this tradition, and mingled with abundance of fable. Let us now attend to the statement of Artabanus, already mentioned, as cited by Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian. "The Memphites say that *Moyse*s, being well acquainted with that part of the country, waited for the ebbing of the tide, and then made the whole multitude pass through the shallows of the sea." It may be here observed, that the Memphites appear to have furnished some of our modern sceptics with one of their great arguments respecting the passage

through the Red Sea. "But the Helio-politans say that the king pursued them with great power, and took with him the sacred animals, in order to recover the substance which the Jews had borrowed from the Egyptians; but that a divine voice instructed Moyses to strike the sea with his rod, whereupon the waves stood apart, and the host went through along a dry path. He (Artabanus) says, moreover, that when the Egyptians came up with them, and followed after them, the fire flashed on them from before, and the sea again inundated their path, and that all the Egyptians perished either by the fire or by the return of the waters. But the Jews escaped the danger, and passed thirty years in the desert, where God rained upon them a kind of grain called *Punic*, whose colour was like snow. He says also that Moyses was ruddy, with light hair, and of a dignified deportment; and that when he did these things he was in the eighty-ninth year of his age."

Similar traditionary extracts might easily be increased, but those now quoted are sufficient to make the reader appreciate the opinions formed by persons unacquainted with Revelation of the great transactions recorded in the Scriptures. But we must hasten to follow Moses, who now entered upon the arduous task of conducting the Israelites to the Promised Land. In the Mosaic writings the reader will find a minute account of their march, and of all the events which befel them, from which it appears that the afflictions they endured in the course of their journeys were intended to train them to a fitness for appreciating and receiving the Divine blessing—to correct their extraordinary inclination towards superstition and idolatry—to prepare them for a peculiar system of legislation which was to be promulgated and established among them, and calculated to preserve them for the gracious purposes of Omnipotence in future ages from the corruptions of the rest of the world—and to maintain the belief in one living and true God, before they entered their promised inheritance.

We can notice only a few of the most prominent transactions which took place in the Wilderness during the various marches of the Hebrews, and their long sojourn of forty years. After celebrating the passage of the Red Sea and the destruction of Pharaoh in the triumphant song already noticed, Moses led the Israelites into the Wilderness of Shur, otherwise Etham, for Shur is a part of Etham. The great sandy desert of Shur divides Egypt from Palestine, and stretches from the Mediterranean to the head of the Red Sea, at the head of both sides of which it anciently received the name of Etham. The general name of Shur is now lost, but it is still in some degree retained in the designation of the channel of a winter torrent called *Wady Sdur*, nearly opposite the Bay of Bedea in the Gulf of Suez, and the coast to some distance northward also bears the name of Sdur. This fact supplies us with some probable intimation that the Israelites emerged from the bed of the gulf somewhere between *Wady Sdur* and the promontory called *Ras Mousa*, or *Cape of Moses*, already mentioned. In this wilderness they marched three days, when they began to be in great distress from want of water. They came at length to a fountain, the water of which they found so bitter that they could not drink it, and they gave it the characteristic appellation of *Marah*, or *bitterness*. This spring, or well, is supposed to be the bitter spring now called Howara, which lies among the rocks about a hundred paces distant from the customary road, along the coast from Suez to Sinai. The water of this well is so bitter that men cannot drink it, and even camels refuse to taste it unless very thirsty. Some travellers inform us that there are several fountains of bitter water not far from the Red Sea; but Burekhardt, who carefully examined the coast, says that there is no other well absolutely bitter on the whole coast, as far as Ras Mohammed, or the Cape of Mahomet, at the extremity of the peninsula of Sinai. The disappointment of the thirsty

Hebrews, wearied with the march in the desert under a sultry sun, is intimated by Moses, with the first symptoms of their proneness to rebellion. "The people," he says, "murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink?" It is repeatedly stated in various articles of the present work that the want of water in the East is one of the greatest calamities to which the inhabitants are exposed. It is a severe privation in any country, but it is more sensibly and instantaneously felt under a burning sun, and in arid sandy deserts. "The complaints," says Burckhardt, "of the bitterness of the water by the children of Israel, who had been accustomed to the sweet water of the Nile, are such as may be daily heard from the Egyptian peasants and servants who travel in Arabia. Accustomed from their youth to the excellent water of the Nile, there is nothing they so much regret in countries distant from Egypt, nor is there any Eastern people who feel so keenly the want of good water as the present natives of Egypt." This is an important statement, and enables us to understand the several rebellions of the Israelites against Moses, and their deep regret at having left Egypt, notwithstanding the oppressions to which they were subject, and their often expressed wish that they had remained rather than encounter the hardships and privations of the wilderness. On this occasion Moses took that course which the Israelites should have done, but which they neglected. He knew, observes the venerable Bishop Hall, to whom to look for redress of all complaints—even to Him alone who can give us comfort in our affliction—who alone can make the bitter waters sweet. Moses did not appeal to Heaven in vain, for "the Lord showed him a tree, which, when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet." The thirsty and exhausted Israelites received with satisfaction the grateful boon, but at the same time they were cautioned to follow the statutes and obey the commandments of Jehovah, if they wished to escape such plagues as

had been brought upon the Egyptians. It is a question whether the waters of Marah were sweetened by the miraculous power of God, or by the properties of the tree to which God directed Moses. Both Niebuhr and Burckhardt, when at the place where this change was effected, frequently inquired among the Bedouins in different parts of Arabia whether they possessed any means of sweetening or rendering bitter water palatable by throwing a certain kind of wood into it, or by any other process, but they never could ascertain that such an art was known. This fact is important; it shows the necessity of the Divine indication of such a tree, and probably of giving corrective qualities to it for the occasion. The Arabic rendering of the verses is—"And the Lord guided him (Moses) to a tree, of which he threw something into the water, which then became sweet." The use of certain plants and vegetable juices in correcting the bad or disagreeable qualities of water admits of ample illustration, but in this instance, the hand of the great Jehovah must be distinctly acknowledged, for it is evident that if such trees or shrubs exist as a common or obvious resource, it cannot be doubted that their useful properties would be known to the Arabs, to whom they would be of incalculable benefit.

The Israelites next encamped at Elim, where it is carefully recorded that "there were twelve wells of water and three score and ten palm-trees." This is all that is stated respecting Elim, supposed to have been near the modern town of Tor, by Dr Shaw, who found at the place he indicates nine wells and two thousand palm-trees, three of the original twelve wells, as he conjectures, having been filled up, and the palm-trees having increased from the seventy found there by Moses. He farther notices that under the shade of the palm-trees—the noblest trees which adorn the solitary waste—is the *Hummum Mousa*, or *Bath of Moses*, which the inhabitants of Tor hold in great veneration, from a tradition that

the tent of Moses was pitched near it. But this identity is disputed; and indeed there is little probability that the Israelites were ever near Tor, which is nearly forty miles out of the way in a journey to Mount Sinai, and by a road which is never taken in proceeding thither by land. But about seven miles south by east from Howara, which we have supposed to be the *Marah* of Moses, occurs the Wady Gharendel, a valley about a mile in breadth, and stretching away to the north-east, full of date-trees, tamarisks, and acacias of different species. This *Wady* is the largest of all the torrent beds on the west side of the peninsula of Sinai, and the existence of a copious spring with a small rivulet, although the water is described as not particularly good, renders it one of the principal stations on the route to Sinai. "If," says Burckhardt, "we admit Bir Howara to be the *Marah* of Exodus, then Wady Gharendel is probably Elim with its wells and date-trees—an opinion entertained by Niebuhr, who, however, did not see the bitter well of Howara, on the road to Gharendel. The non-existence at present of twelve wells at Gharendel must not be considered as evidence against the conjecture just stated, for Niebuhr says that he and his companions obtained water here by digging to a very small depth, and "there was a great plenty of it when I passed—water, in fact, is readily found, by digging in every fertile valley in Arabia, and wells are thus easily formed, which are quickly filled up again with sand." But the brief intimation which Moses gives of Elim reminds us of an explanatory notice which can be introduced with propriety in this part of the narrative. It is this—that in remarking the several stations of the Israelites from the Red Sea to Mount Sinai, Moses does not set down every place where they encamped, as in the Book of Numbers (xxiii.), but only those where something remarkable occurred. Elim, where they now encamped, was esteemed a pleasant and fertile *wady*—and it is worthy of notice, that

the word *Elim* means *valleys*—at least in comparison to the neighbouring barren deserts.

As there was plenty of water at Elim, Moses and the Israelites remained in the encampment there some time, for we find them marching into the Wilderness of Sin "on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departure out of the land of Egypt," which means that they left Elim exactly a month after their first setting out from Goshen. Moses tells us that the Wilderness of Sin is "between Elim and Sinai," which includes most of the region within a few miles of Mount Serbal, the first of the larger mountains of the Sinai groupe. This wilderness is not a flat and continual desert. It is more or less rocky and hilly, with valleys of various dimensions, yet it may be said to be a desolate region, generally sandy or stony, having few plants and little herbage, and also without water, except in the rainy season, when the valleys are traversed by the torrents which descend from the mountains. It was in these remote and desolate regions that the first serious rebellion began. We are told that the "whole congregation of the children of Israel," including the elders or leaders, "murmured" against Moses and Aaron. "Would to God," they exclaimed, "we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh pots, and when we did eat bread to the fill; for ye have brought us forth into this wilderness, to kill this whole assembly with hunger." Here we are to observe that at Elim the *people* expressed their dissatisfaction, but in the present instance we have the "whole congregation" in open insurrection, and it must be confessed that if we had been left ignorant of the corruption of human nature, the conduct of the Israelites during the long course of their history would have been inexplicable, if not incredible. It is not probable that they had abundance of food and "bread to the fill" when they were slaves in Egypt, and suffering under the tyranny of their taskmasters; and in the true spirit of disaf-

fection and ingratitude they misrepresented their former condition, that they might have an excuse for their seditious conduct. Moses does not intimate his own proceedings in this important affair. Jehovah said to him—"Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or no"—namely, that God would try whether they would be obedient to his commands when they were supplied with every thing to support and encourage them in his service, that he might make it appear plainly to themselves and others what they really were. The falling and gathering of this manna, also called *bread from heaven*, and *angels' food*, were announced by Moses and Aaron, who in a dignified remonstrance reproved the Israelites for their unreasonable conduct—"What are we? your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord"—thus declaring that they were merely the instruments and agents of Jehovah, and that their murmurings were not so much against them, which would have been a minor offence, as against that great Jehovah whose almighty power they had recently seen displayed in a most remarkable manner. Jehovah commanded Moses to intimate to the Israelites—"At even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread." This was verified when "at even the quails came up, and covered the camp; and in the morning the dew lay round about the host." The former are birds which remove in prodigious flocks from place to place, having previously remained solitary during the period of incubation, and are often seen crossing the Mediterranean in their passage to and from the coast of Africa. Some commentators think that locusts are specified in the text, but the literal sense is that of the Oriental interpreters, of the Greek translators, and of Josephus. Hasselquist tells us that the quail of the desert very much resembles the red partridge, and is not larger than the turtle-dove. These

birds abound on the coasts of the Red Sea, and though they might settle in countless swarms around the tents of the Israelites without a miracle, yet nothing but the fiat of the Almighty could have sent them thither at an appointed time. God by a wind drove them within and about the camp of Israel, and in this the miracle consisted, for they were brought to the place in such vast numbers as to suffice from two to three millions of persons longer than a month. God gave quails to the Israelites on another occasion, at the encampment called *Kibroth-hattaarah*, or the *graves of lust*, Numb. xi. 31-34; Psalm cv. 40.

The *manna* requires a separate notice. After the dew which lay round about the host had disappeared, "behold, upon the face of the wilderness there lay a small round thing, as small as the hoar-frost on the ground. And when the children of Israel saw it, they said, It is manna; for they wist not what it was. And Moses said, This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat." Again he tells us—"And the house of Israel called the name thereof manna, and it was like coriander seed, white; and the taste of it was like wafers made with honey." Here we are to observe, in reference to the word *manna*, that it was impossible the Hebrews could be ignorant what it was if they at once declared it to be manna, and this passage in our translation is incorrect and contradictory. The meaning of the word is uncertain, but Josephus explicitly states that *man* is a particle of interrogation, and the Septuagint understand it in that sense. Some learned expositors consequently render the clause—"They said one to another, What is it? [*man-hu?*] for they knew not what it was." Others think it may be better expounded, *it is a gift or portion*, as being sent from God. It is unnecessary to enter into any discussion here on the various attempts to identify this manna. The strongest claim applies to the substance called *mann* by the Arabs, which is produced in the Peninsula of Sinai; and if this is not the manna of Scripture,

no other natural production can pretend to the distinction. The Israelites "did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until they came unto the borders of Canaan." It was gathered under several limitations, and an omer of it—something less than half a peck of our measure—was deposited "before the Testimony," and laid up "before the Lord, to be kept for their generations." Some of the Rabbins describe this vessel as of earthen ware, while others of them think it was glass, and others, again, contend for copper or brass; but the Septuagint says it was of gold, and St Paul corroborates this statement.

The Israelites continued their journey through the wilderness of Zin, and encamped at *Rephidim*, which means *beds*, or *places of rest*. They made two short halts between the wilderness and Rephidim not mentioned in the Book of Exodus—one at Dophkah, the other at Alush, and "it may be hinted once for all," observes Shuckford, "that these and the other places where they made their encampments in the wilderness are generally names given by them to the places where they stopped; and that the places were not called by any particular names except by the Israelites on account of their encamping at them." At Rephidim they were again in open rebellion for want of water, and they assailed Moses in language of bitter invective—"Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us, and our children, and our cattle, with thirst?" The strong language they employed shows the intensity of their sufferings in those arid and sultry regions, and Moses seems to admit the force of their appeal, though it was aggravated by their impatience, and by their constantly referring to their pretended comforts in Egypt, thus not only acting against their own convictions, but exhibiting the basest ingratitude. Moses writes that he "cried unto the Lord, saying, What shall I do unto this people? they be almost ready to stone me." He received the Divine command—"Go on before the people,

and take with thee of the elders of Israel; and thy rod, wherewith thou smotest the river [the Nile], take in thine hand, and go. Behold, I will stand before thee [the pillar of cloud, which was the sign of Jehovah's presence] upon the rock in Horeb, and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink." Moses obeyed the Divine injunction, and he informs us that he called the name of the place *Massah*, or *Temptation*, and *Meribah*, or *chiding*, or *strife*, on account of the conduct of the Israelites, who had the boldness to ask—"Is the Lord among us or not?" Although there can be little doubt that Rephidim is that part of the peninsula of Sinai which approaches to Mount Serbal not far from *Wady Feiran*, yet the scene of the transaction is locally fixed in El Ledja, a valley which lies in the very highest region of the Sinai groupe of mountains, between the two peaks regarded as the Sinai and Horeb of Scripture—the former now called Mount Mousa, and the latter Mount St Catherine. This valley is described as very narrow, exceedingly stony, abounding with large blocks of granite rolled down from the overhanging mountains, and, upon the whole, the most unlikely of any spot in the neighbourhood to have been the scene of this miracle. Nevertheless, in a particular part of it there occurs an isolated block of granite about twelve feet high and of an irregular shape, which the monks in the convent of Sinai and the Arabs of the district maintain to be the same as that struck by Moses with his rod, from which the water gushed forth, and there are apertures upon its surface, about twenty in number, ten or twelve inches long, two or three inches broad, and from one to four inches deep, from which the water is said to have issued. "Every observer," says Burckhardt, to whom we are indebted for an account of this valley and its rock, "must be convinced, on the slightest examination, that most of these fissures are the work of art, but three or four perhaps are natural, and these may

first have drawn the attention of the monks to the stone, and may have induced them to call it the rock of miraculous supply of water, though it cannot be doubted that if water had flowed from the fissures it must generally have taken a quite different direction.—They [the neighbouring Arabs, who venerate this rock highly] put grass into the fissures as offerings to the memory of Moses, in the same way as they place grass upon the tombs of their saints, because grass is to them the most precious gift of nature, and that upon which their existence chiefly depends. They also bring hither their female camels, for they believe that, by making the animal crouch down before the rock, while they recite some prayers, and by putting fresh grass into the fissures of stone, the camels will become fertile, and yield an abundance of milk. This superstition is much encouraged by the monks, who rejoice to see the infidel Arabs venerating the same object with themselves.”

While the Israelites lay encamped in Rephidim they were attacked by the Amalekites, the descendants of the eldest son of Esau; and this is another reason for preferring the region which stretches to Mount Serbal from Wady Feiran as the real Rephidim, rather than the valley called El Ledja, now noticed. Burckhardt quotes an Egyptian geographer named Makrizi, who, speaking of the town of Feiran, in the *wady* or *valley* of that name, says it was one of the towns of the Amalekites. The Wady Feiran was then inhabited by these Arab Amalekites, and hence their design in attacking the Israelites is obvious and intelligible. They wished to restrain the farther progress of the Israelites; and they probably had set wistful eyes on the rich spoils which the wanderers had gathered from the Egyptians—promising themselves, at the same time, an easy victory over such an undisciplined and mixed multitude. As soon as the hostile Amalekites appeared to attack the Israelites, Moses summoned Joshua, who is first noticed on

this occasion, and who seems to have been a person of influence even at this early stage of the progress of the Israelites. Moses said to him—“Choose us out men, and go out to fight with Amalek: to-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand.” Joshua obeyed the injunction of his great leader, while Moses, accompanied by Aaron and Hur, who, according to Josephus, was married to his sister Miriam, went to the top of the hill, from which the region stretching towards Wady Feiran can be surveyed. In the conflict which followed we are told that “when Moses held up his hand, Israel prevailed; and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed.” But the hands of Moses “were heavy,” which means that he became fatigued by keeping them long unsupported in that uplifted attitude, and his companions “took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side and the other on the other side, and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun.” The Amalekites were utterly defeated, and the victory was ordered to be duly recorded, and to be “rehearsed in the ears of Joshua,” that he who was to be the leader of God’s people after Moses might never enter into any league with the cruel and ungenerous Nomades. An altar was erected in commemoration, and called *Jehovah-Nissi*, or *the Lord my banner*; for Moses said, “Because the Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation;” or, as it is rendered in the marginal reading, *Because the hand of Amalek is against the throne of the Lord*—namely, against Jehovah himself. “The reason,” observes Stackhouse, “why God denounced a perpetual war against the Amalekites is to be resolved into this—that, knowing the Israelites were ordained by God to be put in possession of the Land of Canaan, they came against them with an armed force, in hopes of frustrating the designs of Pro-

vidence. Moses assigns this reason, as in the margin. The injury done to the Israelites was not so great an offence as the affront offered to the Divine Majesty, and therefore God threatened utterly to extirpate the designers."

At this time Moses received a visit from his father-in-law Jethro, the priest of Midian, who had "heard of all that God had done for him, and for Israel his people; and that the Lord had brought Israel out of Egypt." Jethro brought with him his daughter Zipporah, the wife of Moses, and the two sons of the illustrious Hebrew by that marriage, from which it appears that when Moses saw the difficulties he had to encounter in Egypt, he had sent her back to her father. The Israelites were now encamped near Horeb, the mount of God, which is in the immediate neighbourhood of the ancient Midian, and where Moses had recently tended Jethro's flocks. The interview between the venerable priest of Midian and his son-in-law is beautifully recorded by the latter. "And Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and did obeisance, and kissed him; and they asked each other of their welfare, and they came into the tent." The joy expressed by Jethro, after he had heard from Moses the eventful narrative of "all that the Lord had done unto Pharaoh, and to the Egyptians for Israel's sake, and all the travail that had come upon them by the way, and how the Lord delivered them," evinces his belief in the true God—that He alone was the Most High, and greater than all whom the world accounted deities. We are told that Jethro "took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for God; and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God." It is thought that these offerings were made by Jethro after the promulgation of the Law on Mount Sinai, but that Moses mentions it sooner for the purpose of comprising all that belongs to Jethro's history. It is not stated how long the priest of Midian remained with the Israelites, or when he left them.

The visit of Jethro to Moses was attended with one important circumstance, which must not be forgotten. Moses acted as the judge of the Israelites in all matters of dispute, and in that capacity Jethro witnessed his manner of discharging the onerous duty. He asked Moses—"What is this thing that thou doest to the people? Why sittest thou thyself alone, and all the people stand by thee from morning till even?" Moses replied—"Because the people come unto me to inquire of God. When they have a matter they come unto me, and I judge between one and another, and I do make them know the statutes of God and his laws." The experienced Jethro saw the labour which this procedure necessarily caused, as well as the delay which must ensue from only one person discharging the duty of a judge, and advised Moses to adopt a course which would greatly relieve him of the fatigue, while it would serve the same purpose, and be followed by obvious advantages. "Hearken now unto my voice, I will give thee counsel, and God shall be with thee.—Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and placing such over them, to be rulers of thousands and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties and rulers of tens; and let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge; so shall it be easier for thyself, and they shall bear the burden with thee. If thou shalt do this thing, and God command thee so, then thou shalt be able to endure, and all this people shall also go to their place in peace." Moses adopted the plan of Jethro, which appears to have received the Divine sanction. In Egypt the Israelites were probably subject to the Egyptian judges, and as no rules for the administration of justice were in operation when they left that country, Moses remained the sole judge until Jethro's very admirable plan was adopted, which was on a peculiarly arithmetical principle, and associated

with the military division of a host into thousands, hundreds, and tens. Many writers contend that, notwithstanding the subsequent appointment of the great council of seventy elders, noticed in the Book of Numbers (xi. 16), the constitution now adopted continued in operation even after the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan. This, however, is a matter of doubt, and if it did exist, it must have been greatly modified when they settled in irregular communities in the Promised Land. As it was, when adopted by Moses it was well suited to the circumstances of the Israelites in the desert, during their encampments and marchings in military array. The judges of tens decided small matters, but referred causes which could not be judged by them, or from which, when they gave their decision, an appeal was taken, to the judges of hundreds, and these in the same way to the judges of thousands. As there must have been 60,000 judges of tens in the Hebrew host, the opinion of Michaelis is probably correct that they had not all seats and voices in the great deliberative assemblies. Those assemblies would consist of the judges of hundreds and of thousands, or they might be limited to the latter. The celebrated Lord Bacon, in his "Essay on English Government," conjectures that Alfred the Great took his idea of the old Saxon constitution of sheriffs in counties from this judicious plan of Jethro—*hundreds* or *centgraves* in hundreds, and *deceners* in decennaries or tythings, who were a kind of justices of peace in their respective divisions.

The Israelites arrived at Sinai where the Law was to be given, and they were to be constituted into a separate and peculiar people. It is unnecessary here to enter into any geographical and statistical details respecting this celebrated mountain and its twin peak of Horeb, as these are often alluded to in the present article, nor shall we attempt to describe minutely the great transactions and the mighty displays of Omnipotence which attended the delivery of the Decalogue

on the two tables written by the finger of Jehovah. Moses, having ascended several times to the Mount, received the Law from God in a miraculous manner, in the midst of thunders and lightnings, and concluded the famous covenant between the Almighty Jehovah and the Israelites. During his absence of forty days and forty nights on the mysterious summit of Sinai, attended by his minister Joshua, the charge of the Israelites was committed to Aaron and Hur, with instructions to settle and adjust all matters of importance until his return. It was during this time that the glory of the great Jehovah rested on the summit of the mountain, and this glory was "like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel." The awful grandeur and sublime majesty of the scene in this rocky and mountainous peninsula of Arabia, as described by Moses himself, can be more readily conceived than adequately delineated in the most forcible and eloquent language. It was a series of transactions and a scene in which the whole world was deeply interested, and yet how few were aware in other countries of the mighty manifestations of the Deity on the Mount of God? The "voice of the trumpet" of Omnipotence was then heard in those mysterious and almost inaccessible solitudes, for ever hallowed by the most sacred associations, the most magnificent announcements, and the most solemn denunciations. A shepherd of Midian stood on the elevated peak of Sinai, and received a code of laws from the great God of heaven and of earth, which has civilized nations, elevated human society, and rendered illustrious the agents employed in its promulgation. And how awfully typical is the whole narrative, to the careful study of which the reader is directed—how pregnant with momentous consequences—of present peace and future happiness? Here, on Sinai, truth was manifested to the whole world—that truth which was to illuminate the nations when consummated, ratified, and established by the Son of God in the likeness

of sinful men. But let us do more than merely contemplate that wonderful manifestation of the Divine Majesty—when “Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole Mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, and God answered by a voice.” Let us attend to its import, and learn from it the salutary lessons of wisdom, of virtue, and of practical instruction. “If the Law,” says the venerable Bishop Hall, “were given with such majesty and terror, how shall it be required? If such were the proclamation of God’s statutes, what shall the judgment be? I see, and tremble at the resemblance. The trumpet of the angel called unto the one—the voice of an archangel, the trumpet of God, shall summon us to the other. To the one, Moses, who climbed up the hill, and alone saw it, says, ‘God came with ten thousand of his saints;’ in the other, ‘thousand thousands shall minister to Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand shall stand before Him.’ In the one Mount Sinai was only in a flame; all the world shall be so in the other. In the one there were fire, smoke, thunder, and lightning; in the other, a fiery stream shall issue from Him, wherewith the heavens shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt away with a noise. O God, how powerful art thou to inflict vengeance upon sinners, who didst thus forbid sin! And if thou wert so terrible a Lawgiver, what a Judge shalt thou appear!”

But the visible manifestation of the Divine Presence resting on or overshadowing the holy Mount of Sinai had not that effect on the Israelites which was to have been expected, or at least they did not understand its real import and meaning. The long and continued absence of Moses made them despair of his return, and as he was the agent through whom their deliverance had been effected, and had stood, as it were,

between them and God, there seemed a vacancy in their system, which, as the priesthood and the regular course of services were not yet established, led them either to think of a system of their own, or of a partial adaptation of their new principle to the practice with which they were familiar. The Israelites were tainted with the idolatry of Egypt, and in the Book of Joshua (xxiv. 14) it is expressly stated they had while in Egypt followed the gods of that country. But even if this information had been wanting, the fact of their predilection for the idolatry of Egypt would be sufficiently apparent from their conduct on various occasions; and as Apis, or the living bull, was one of the most conspicuous objects in the Egyptian mythology, a sufficient explanation is given of the direction taken by the first apostasy of the Israelites. This was the formation and setting up of the golden calf as an object of worship, and which they designed to represent the great Jehovah, whom they worshipped in this image. To render the identification of the calf with Apis more complete, it is necessary to state that while the living bull was worshipped at Memphis, there were in other places representative images sometimes in the form of a bull, and frequently in a human figure with a bull’s head. It is just remarked that the long absence of Moses induced the Israelites to think of a system of their own, or to adapt their new principles to practices they well knew, and they applied to Aaron to give effect to their intentions. They gathered themselves together, and said to him, “Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wit not what is become of him.” They persuaded Aaron to comply with their request, and the molten calf was set up, with the proclamation—“These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt.” See AARON.

Moses received intimation of this transaction from Jehovah himself, who in his wrath threatened to consume them, but

at the earnest intercession of his servant, the divine compassion was extended toward them, though they were not to escape without suffering some punishment for a crime which, though it did not consist of an utter apostacy from God, was little better than gross idolatry, for it was an unauthorized and interdicted intrusion of Egyptian ideas and practices into the worship of Jehovah. Moses was ordered to depart from the mountain to stop this apostacy, and when he drew near in his descent he beheld the deluded multitude joyfully engaged in a festival in honour of their new deity. Joshua, who was with him, thought the noise resembled a noise of war in the camp, but Moses, who knew well the real cause of it, sententiously replied—"It is not the voice of them that shout for mastery, neither is it the voice of them that cry for being overcome; but the noise of them that sing do I hear." When he approached the molten image, the people fell back at his unexpected appearance, silence succeeded the recent hilarity and revelry, and a consciousness of guilt pervaded the assembled multitude. Enraged at the very sight of this emblem of apostacy and of ingratitude to God for their emancipation from the degradation of Egyptian bondage, and alarmed for the consequences which might follow such a flagrant dereliction of principle, Moses let fall the divine tables of the decalogue he held in his hands, or rather he threw them on the ground, that the people might see the indignation with which he beheld their conduct, and as he is no where blamed for breaking those tables, we may conclude that he did so by the impulse of inspiration. He then "took the calf which they had made, and burnt it in the fire, and ground it into powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink of it"—that water which they had received not long before in a remarkable manner from the solid rock. He turned to Aaron, and severely reproved him for his conduct in the affair, who in reply gave an excusatory narrative of the whole affair, which terminates

in a very confused manner, as if conscious of error, but afraid to avow it. The indignant leader then placed himself in the gate of the camp, and exclaimed with a loud voice—"Who is on the Lord's side? let him come unto me." The sons of Levi instantly obeyed the summons, to whom Moses intimated the command of Jehovah—"Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour." The Levites put to the sword no fewer than nearly three thousand persons, for Moses had said, "Consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord, even every man upon his son, and upon his brother, that he may bestow upon you a blessing this day." On the following day Moses addressed the people. "Ye have sinned a great sin," he said, "and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins." He did so in the most earnest and affecting manner, and in language which evinces the deep interest he took in the temporal and spiritual welfare of the people. He was to a certain extent successful, and it pleased the Lord to "plague the people, because they made the calf, which Aaron made."

Moses again ascended the mysterious mountain of Sinai, and obtained new tables of stone, on which the Law was inscribed. When he returned, his face shone with such remarkable brightness that the Israelites did not dare to look at him, until he had covered himself with a veil. He "called unto them, and Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation returned unto him, and Moses talked with them. And afterward all the children of Israel came nigh, and he gave them in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him on Mount Sinai." In this assemblage of the people, or in one immediately succeeding, Moses announced God's renewal of his covenant with them—enjoined the strict observance of the Sabbath—declared the command which he had received to erect a

tabernacle of the most costly materials, and invited to exhibit liberality in their voluntary offerings for the completion of this undertaking. On this occasion there appears to have been a generous rivalry among the Israelites to contribute their valuable effects and ornaments towards the work, the execution of which was entrusted by the Divine direction to Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, and to Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan, who superintended those "true-hearted men in whom the Lord had put wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the sanctuary, according to all that the Lord had commanded." So liberal were the offerings that those charged with the performance of the work intimated to Moses—"The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work which the Lord commanded to make;"—and Moses issued a proclamation, declaring that no farther contributions were required. The tabernacle was finished in six months, when it was consecrated by Moses, who anointed Aaron as the high-priest, and his sons as assistants in the worship; and then commenced, in the year B. C. 1490, according to the Hebrew chronology, that magnificent ritual or service of the Deity which was adapted to the existing circumstances of the Israelites, and which was typical, in all its parts, of that spiritual worship which the Christian dispensation was to perpetuate. Hence St Paul informs us that the Jewish Law was an imperfect dispensation from the first, or rather that it was complete in itself, so far as it went, but typical in its nature, and temporary in its duration, and "added because of transgressions till the seed should come;" and farther, that in great condescension it was adapted to the state of the Jewish people, whom he compares to an heir under a tutor or governor, the Law being our "schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," and having only "a shadow of good things to come." Thus, the Jewish religion was, in its

several particular institutions, intended in a great measure to typify and prefigure the more perfect dispensation of the Gospel. The high-priest was an obvious type of our blessed Saviour, the great High-Priest of the Holy Church throughout all the world; the tabernacle was also a type of Christ dwelling in our nature, as was the ark in the Holy of Holies, with its mercy-seat, an emblem of Him from whose mouth we have received the Law of the new covenant, and whose satisfaction to divine justice is our true *propitiatory* or *mercy-seat*. But, at the same time, as the "chief end," says Stackhouse, "of the several institutions relating to the ceremonial part of the Jewish worship was to prefigure the person and transactions of our blessed Saviour, so the ceremonies appointed under it could never be of any esteem in the sight of God except they tended to promote this end, and to prepare men's minds for the reception of a perfect institution of religion."

The next transaction of any importance is the affair of Nadab and Abihu, two of the sons of Aaron, who were guilty of burning incense in the sanctuary without the permission of Jehovah, and of using for that purpose common fire, taken from some other place, and not that which God had peculiarly sent for the service of the sanctuary. Their fate was calculated to make a deep impression on the Israelites, and more especially on Aaron and his two surviving sons, Eleazar and Ithamar, who were strictly forbidden to utter the slightest lamentation for them. We are told that there "went out fire from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord," which intimates that there came a flash from the Divine Presence, sent either from the altar or from above, and "devoured" them, or scorched their inward and vital parts, without consuming their bodies. This severity of immediate punishment was necessary towards the first transgressors of the Law, to deter others from the same offence, and to increase the reverential awe of the Divine Majesty. It was a striking

instance of the impartiality and justice of Jehovah, showing that He is "no respecter of persons," for even the sons of Aaron were the objects of punishment. Moses intimated this to Aaron himself, who heard it in silence, and in patient and humble submission. "This," said Moses, "is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified;" and the meaning is, that Jehovah would be revered by His priests in a special manner before the people, or that He would glorify himself by vindicating his honour, and by punishing those priests who would dare to offend in such a manner before the congregation.

A variety of particulars is detailed in the first nine chapters of the Book of Numbers respecting the first numbering or mustering of the Israelites in the beginning of the second year after their departure from Egypt, the consecration of the tabernacle, the offerings of the princes at its dedication, the order of the tribes in their tents, the sons of Aaron, the substitution of the Levites for the first-born in the service of the tabernacle, the number and charge of the three great branches of the Levitical families of Gershonites, Kohathites, and Merarites. To all these, and other interesting matters minutely narrated by Moses, the reader is referred to the inspired historian. The Hebrews remained eleven months and nineteen days at the foot of Mount Sinai, during which time we have seen that the "necessary laws were given, the tabernacle was set up for the palace of their king Jehovah, the regular service of his court was established, the sanctions of the Law were solemnly repeated, the people were numbered for the approaching war, the order of encamping, breaking up, and marching, was accurately settled, and the whole constitution of the state was completed." On the twentieth day of the second month of the second year after their departure from Egypt, the Israelites, by command of Moses, broke up their encampment, and proceed-

ed once more on their journey towards the land of their inheritance. They were now in a more peculiar manner, since the delivery of the Law, under the immediate direction of the Most High God, who governed them by his servant Moses, whom he had chosen to be the interpreter of his will and the promulgator of his commands among the people, but he required all the honours belonging to their king to be paid to himself as their Invisible Sovereign. Jehovah assumed to dwell in the tabernacle, which was always in the midst of the camp, and he denounced punishments against the transgressors of his laws. This, it has been appropriately observed, was properly the period of the theocracy taken in its full extent, for God was not only considered as the only true and proper object of religious worship, but as the sovereign to whom the honours of supreme majesty were rendered. Moses informs us that preparatory to the breaking up of the encampment he was commanded to make two trumpets of silver—"of a whole piece," said Jehovah to him, "shalt thou make them, that thou mayest use them for the calling of the assembly, and for the journeying of the camps." The number *two* is probably mentioned, because there were only two priests to blow them, but we know that in subsequent times the number was enlarged as the priests increased, for in the reign of Solomon there were one hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets. Josephus, who gives a particular description of the trumpets made on the present occasion, claims for Moses the invention of this form of those instruments. Moses gives sundry directions how and when they were to be used, but his account of the movement from Sinai solely refers to that of the two grand divisions. "When ye blow an alarm, then the camps that lie on the east parts shall go forward. When ye blow an alarm, then the camps that lie on the south side shall take their journey; they shall blow an alarm for their journeys. But when the congregation is to be gathered together ye shall

blow ; but ye shall not sound an alarm." In the Septuagint version, however, we have an account of the other two divisions :—"When ye blow a third alarm, the camps that lie on the west side shall march ; and when ye blow a fourth alarm, the camps which lie on the north side shall march." The admirable arrangement of the Hebrew camp, and the order observed in the march of such a numerous host, were not excelled by the military tactics of the Greeks and Romans. The Israelites marched by sound of trumpet always in the same order, and quartered themselves in the same situation, about the tabernacle, which was always in the centre of the camp. Every division was placed under the command of its own prince, and followed its own standards. The grand eastern division, consisting of the tribe of Judah, followed by those of Issachar and Zebulun, first commenced its march ; then the tabernacle was taken down, and the Gershonites and Merarites set forward with it. Then came the tribe of Reuben, followed by those of Simeon and Gad, after whom the Kohathites marched with the sanctuary and sacred utensils—thus occupying the very centre of the line of march, and when they arrived at the new camp they found the tabernacle set up, and properly prepared to receive the sacred charge entrusted to them. After them came the grand western division, composed of the tribe of Ephraim, followed by those of Manasseh and Benjamin ; and lastly, the northern division, consisting of the tribes of Dan, Asher, and Naphtali, moved from the ground, and brought up the rear.

In this manner the Israelites marched from Sinai, and proceeded through the mountainous defiles into the great sandy desert of Zin, as far as Kadesh. This desert is the low sandy plain or valley which extends from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akaba, on the other side of the Peninsula of Sinai, and through which the Jordan appears to have flowed to the Red Sea before the destruction of the Cities of the Plain. This plain is wholly destitute of water, and its average breadth

is about five miles. Moses informs us that he took with him Hobab, the son of his father-in-law Jethro, as a guide. Jethro had returned to his own district, as already noticed, but it appears that Hobab remained with his sister Zipporah, while her husband Moses continued near Sinai, which was not far from Midian. When the Israelites broke up their encampment by Divine command, Hobab proposed to return to his father, but Moses was desirous that he would accompany them to the Promised Land. The Hebrew leader overcame his reluctance by his earnest entreaty—"Leave us not, I pray thee, forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes. And it shall be, if thou go with us, yea, it shall be, that what goodness the Lord shall do unto us, the same will we do unto thee." From this it is evident that Hobab was capable of rendering essential service to the Israelites in the sterile and desolate regions they were about to traverse. He knew every part of the wilderness, and could advise them how to secure their camp, for the cloud directed them where to pitch it, to defend themselves from the neighbouring people, and to provide themselves with whatever necessities the desert afforded. But besides these considerations Moses informs us of several journeys undertaken by detachments of the Israelites, while the main body remained at rest. Thus, we read (Numb. xiii.) of a party sent to reconnoitre the land of Canaan, of the messengers (Numb. xx.) sent from Kadesh to the king of Edom—of an expedition (Numb. xxxi.) against the idolatrous Midianites—of various minor expeditions (Numb. xxxii.), and similar journeys would be doubtless undertaken which are not recorded. Moses, anticipating such excursions, might well entreat Hobab to accompany him, not as a single Arab, but as the head of a tribe, or clan, to supply conductors for the detached parties, while the body of the people and the cloud of Jehovah remained stationary.

This is implied in the reason assigned by Moses to his brother-in-law—"That thou mayest be to us instead of eyes." Hobab accompanied Moses, and his posterity settled among the Israelites in Canaan. They sometimes occur under the denomination of Kenites, and a race of them were called Rechabites. There was, however, another tribe of Kenites, much more ancient, from which they are to be distinguished (Numb. x. 29-32; xxiv. 21, 22; Judges i. 16; iv. 11; 1 Chron. ii. 55; 2 Kings x. 15; and Jer. xxv. 2, compared with Gen. xv. 19). "It is worthy of remark," observes Jahn, "that the cloud which hung over the sacred tabernacle, and by its rising and setting determined the marches of the Israelites, did not supersede the necessity of another guide, who could conduct them to the secret fountains, the concealed wells, and the distant pastures of the desert."

Some transactions occurred during the march from Sinai which ought not to be unnoticed. The Israelites had not proceeded far in the burning and arid desert until they exhibited their usual discontented spirit, which was doubtless aggravated by the miseries of their situation and the fatigues they had to encounter. Their murmurings and complaints excited the indignation of Jehovah, whose fire burnt among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp. By this we are to understand either a fire sent directly among them from heaven like lightning, or from the pillar of the cloud which went before the tabernacle; or it might have been a hot burning wind, not unusual in these deserts, and most pestilential, raised on this occasion in the rear of the host to punish the stragglers, and such as loitered behind on the pretence of weariness. Chardin describes this wind as making a loud hissing noise, appearing, as it were, red and fiery, and causing death by suffocation. The Hebrews became alarmed at this severe scourge, and "cried unto Moses, and when Moses prayed unto the Lord the fire was quenched." The scene

of this mortality was called *Taberah*, or *the burning*.

They had not long been released from this calamity when the "mixed multitude that was among them fell a lusting," or, as it is in the margin, *lusted a lust*. The discontent was soon communicated to the whole, who gave utterance to their feelings and inclinations by loud lamentations and expressions of grief. They became tired of the manna, which they now loathed and despised, and they emphatically declared that "their soul was dried away," like the earth when parched and rendered barren for want of moisture. "Who," they exclaimed, "shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat freely in Egypt; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the garlick." This allusion to their food in Egypt is highly interesting, and the recollection must have increased the intensity of their sufferings in the sultry desert of Zin. Though fish is at all times abundant and a common diet in Egypt, it is used more particularly in the hot season, occasioned by the prevalence of the south winds in April and May, when the inhabitants scarcely eat any thing but fish with pulse and herbs, the great heat taking away the appetite for all sorts of flesh meat; and the Israelites, who were now in the midst of the hot season in Arabia, which is rather later than in Egypt, longed with impatience for the fish and refreshing vegetables they had been accustomed at such seasons to enjoy. The fruits and roots mentioned by the Israelites—cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, and garlick—are all different from and of a superior flavour to ours, and of these the Orientals are passionately fond. A striking illustration of the sufferings of the Israelites on this occasion, and how desirable such food is to those who have been accustomed to it, may be inferred from a fact related by De Vitriaco, and quoted by Harmer. The former mentions that when Damietta was besieged in 1218, many of the more delicate Egyptians, although they had corn in abundance, pined

away, and actually died for want of the garlic, onions, fish, birds, fruits, and herbs, to which they had been accustomed.

The Israelites gave utterance to their longing inclinations as if they had been in a state of starvation, but their great sin probably consisted in their continual recurrence to what they had enjoyed in Egypt, wilfully forgetting their degraded condition in that country, and ungratefully undervaluing or despising the many signs and wonders which Jehovah had wrought in their behalf. We are told that the "anger of the Lord was kindled greatly; Moses also was displeased." He seems to have been greatly distressed at the complaints of the people, especially when he saw them "weep throughout their families, every man in the door of his tent;" and he attempted no remonstrance at their unreasonable conduct, but he betook himself immediately to Jehovah, to whom he represented the situation in which he was placed, and his utter inability to calm the popular excitement. His address to Jehovah is peculiarly energetic and affecting. "Wherefore hast thou afflicted thy servant? and wherefore have I not found favour in thy sight, that thou layest the burden of all this people upon me? Have I conceived all this people? have I begotten them, that thou shouldest say unto me, Carry them in thy bosom, as a nursing father beareth the sucking child, unto the land which thou swarest unto their fathers? Whence should I have flesh to give unto all this people? for they weep unto me, saying, Give us flesh, that we may eat. I am not able to bear all this people alone, because it is too heavy for me. And if thou deal thus with me, kill me, I pray thee, out of hand, if I have found favour in thy sight, and let me not see my wretchedness." The great Jehovah listened to his servant, and commanded him to collect seventy of the elders of Israel, whom he knew to be elders of the people and officers over them, and to bring them into the tabernacle of the congregation, where they were to stand

with him. This, it may be remarked in passing, is generally believed to have been the origin of the great national council of the Jews called in after ages the Sanhedrim. "I will come down," said Jehovah to Moses, "and talk with thee, and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them, and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone." This intimates that some of the gifts bestowed on Moses would be conferred upon them, but that those of the Hebrew leader would not be diminished. As the persons appointed by Jethro's advice (Exod. xviii.) were to judge only in inferior matters, and all appeals were still left to be decided by Moses, it was probably to relieve him of this onerous burden, which must have been severe when the Israelites were in a state of discontent and insubordination, that these seventy were chosen, as men of superior capacity, who were to be assisted by the Spirit of God in their judgments and determinations. The remainder of the discourse between Jehovah and his servant is of the most ominous nature. "Say thou unto the people, Sanctify yourselves against tomorrow, and ye shall eat flesh, for ye have wept in the ears of the Lord, saying, Who shall give us flesh to eat? for it was well with us in Egypt; therefore the Lord will give you flesh, and ye shall eat. Ye shall eat not one day, nor two days, nor five days, neither ten days, nor twenty days; but even a whole month, until it come out at your nostrils, and it be loathsome unto you; because that ye have despised the Lord which is among you, and have wept before him, saying, Why came we forth out of Egypt?" Moses replied—"The people among whom I am are six hundred thousand footmen, and thou hast said, I will give them flesh that they may eat a whole month. Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them, to suffice them? or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?" Moses here proposes a difficulty in accomplishing the

Divine promise—not that he doubted it could be done by miracle, for he knew that the same Almighty power which rained down manna could by a miracle gorge them with flesh, but he was evidently at a loss to comprehend how it could be effected in the common course of things, or even in the natural though more unusual operation of Providence. They had flocks and herds, but these could not, even with what might be procured from the nomade Arab tribes on the skirts of the desert, suffice such a multitude for a month. Fish could be obtained from the Red Sea, from which they were not very far distant; but it was not to be expected that they would proceed to its shores in such numbers, day by day, to satisfy the cravings of their appetites for the same space of time. To the questions of Moses the Divine answer was given—“Is the Lord’s hand waxed short? thou shalt now see whether my word shall come to pass unto thee or not.”

In obedience to the injunction of Jehovah, Moses announced to the people the message he had received, and convened the seventy elders round about the tabernacle. We are told that “the Lord came down in a cloud;” and part of the spirit which was upon Moses, or with which he was endued, was given to the seventy elders, and “they prophesied, and did not cease.” The word *prophecy*, as every biblical scholar knows, is of very extensive signification, but it probably here means singing and praising God, and chaunting divine hymns. They “did not cease,” namely, they continued their devout exercises all that day, while they stood about the tabernacle; for this gift of prophecy was to procure for them the reverence of the people, as an evident and undeniable sign that they were chosen by God to be coadjutors to Moses. But two of the seventy, named Eldad and Medad, who were included in the summons to attend, “went not out unto the tabernacle, and they prophesied in the camp.” They might not have been in the way when

the command was given, or they might have modestly declined the dignity, or were reluctant to engage in the management of such an unruly people, or they might be under some impediment which restrained them from approaching the tabernacle. A person informed Moses of the circumstance, and Joshua, who was present, instantly said, “My lord Moses, forbid them.” He thought that the authority of Moses would be diminished if these two men, who, by their not appearing at the tabernacle might appear to have no commission from him, were allowed to exercise this privilege. But Moses, whose sole regard was for the honour and glory of his Master, exclaimed, “Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord’s people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them.” He knew that if Jehovah had revealed his divine will to every Israelite, all the people would have at once seen their duty as well as himself; and he, not seeking his own honour, but sincerely desiring to be “faithful to Him that appointed him,” would have rejoiced to see God’s purposes and designs effectually acknowledged and operating among the people. Immediately after this transaction myriads of quails were brought a second time to the Israelites from the Red Sea, and they fell “by the camp, as it were a day’s journey on this side, and as it were a day’s journey on the other side, round about the camp, and as it were two cubits high upon the face of the earth.” The Hebrews readily “gathered the quails,” and “they spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp.” But the compliance of Jehovah was in this instance accompanied by a signal punishment. We are told that “while the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the people, and the Lord smote the people with a very great plague.” The scene of this calamity was called *Kibroth-Hattaavah*, or *the graves of lust*, because “there they buried the people that lusted.” The

history of this transaction affords us the first direct intimation in Scripture of animal food being prepared in such a manner as to be preserved for future occasions, and as our earliest information concerning the Egyptians describes them as salting and drying great quantities of fish and fowl, we may safely conclude that the Israelites became acquainted with that process in Egypt. "Maillet speaks of some islanders," says Harmer, "near Egypt stripping the feathers from certain birds of passage, probably quails among the number, and burying them in the burning sand for about a quarter of an hour. This explains the design of spreading the quails round about the camp. It was to dry them in the burning sands, in order to preserve them. So Maillet tells us of their drying fish in the sun in Egypt; and other authors speak of the Arabs drying camel's flesh in the sun and wind, which, though not at all salted, will remain good a long while if kept dry, and may be eaten without dressing."

The Israelites broke up their encampment, and proceeded to *Hazereth*, a name which signifies *villages* or *hamlets*. Here another circumstance occurred, with which, however, the Israelites as a body had no concern, it being rather a personal or family affair than one which excited any interest among the people. We are told that "Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married; and they said, Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? hath he not spoken also by us?" As Miriam, the sister of Moses, is mentioned first, she was probably the origin of this sedition, and it is evident that she alludes to that important occasion when, as a prophetess, she joined with Moses in his triumphant hymn on the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, and led the women with timbrels and dances. Zipporah was not, strictly speaking, an Ethiopian. She was simply a native of a part of Arabia originally occupied by the descendants of Cush, the son of Ham, and which was

consequently, like other parts of Arabia, settled by the Cushites, called Cush or Ethiopia. Some contend that the person against whom this discontent was excited was not Zipporah, but another wife, Zipporah being dead. There is, however, not the slightest ground for this conjecture. We know that she had been recently brought to her husband, and as her brother Hobab is mentioned in a preceding chapter, it is natural, when we find this affair following immediately, to suppose that Miriam and Aaron regarded her with peculiar discontent and jealousy.

A parenthetical clause is inserted in this part of the history which is worthy of attention. "(Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.)" It has been urged by several sceptical writers that this clause furnishes one argument against the fact that Moses was the author of the Books ascribed to him, because no man, however great might be his egotism, would speak of himself in such manner. It may be replied, that as the sense of the narrative is complete without it, the clause might have been introduced by Ezra, or some other person, and certainly the expression, *the man Moses*, no where else occurs. But the word (*anav*) translated *meek*, may with equal propriety be rendered *afflicted* or *depressed*, and that Moses really was so, and had cause to be so, is too evident from what follows. Yet some commentators justify the clause as it is currently rendered on very satisfactory grounds. "It is added," says Bishop Patrick, "as the reason why he passed by the affront they put upon him, and why God avenged it. It is also a confutation of their charge against him, showing that he was so far from the pride they imputed to him, that he did not resent their undutiful behaviour, so that it is not so much a commendation as a necessary account of himself. To such vindications of themselves the humblest souls may be constrained by the calumnies of wicked men, as we see not only in St Paul, but in our blessed Saviour also, when assailed by the malignity of

their enemies (John x. 36 ; 2 Cor. xi. 10, 23). And this is the more allowable, when men know not only that they write the truth, but that it is notorious to all who are acquainted with them. The holy writers also are not to be confined to our rules, being moved by the Holy Ghost to set down things which of themselves perhaps they would not have mentioned. Men who have a due reverence for the Scriptures will look on this rather as the Holy Ghost's testimony concerning Moses, than as the testimony of Moses concerning himself."

The conduct of Miriam and Aaron excited the displeasure of Jehovah, who in a divine communication to Moses ordered him and his two discontented relatives to appear in the tabernacle of the congregation. It was distinctly announced by the Divine presence in the pillar of cloud that Moses was the appointed and faithful messenger of God. "With him," said Jehovah, "will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold ; wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses ?" Miriam, as the more guilty person, was smitten with leprosy, and was ordered to be shut out from the camp seven days, when the punishment was removed. It appears that Moses interceded for her instant recovery, but the Lord said unto him—"If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days ?"—and the seven days expulsion from the camp was ordered to be inflicted. The word translated *in her face* may also mean *before her face*, or *in her presence*. It appears from this statement that among the Hebrews the act of expectoration on the part of a parent before his children so disgraced his children as to render them unclean, and oblige them to live apart seven days. This act, notwithstanding the abundant use of tobacco, seldom takes place in the East, and when it does it is regarded as indicating strong disgust and detestation towards the person in whose presence it is done, or

towards any one absent whose conduct is the subject of conversation.

During this seven days of Miriam's penitential purification the Hebrews remained in their encampment at Hazeroth, but as soon as she was restored to her family they struck their tents and marched to the wilderness of Paran. Here Moses was ordered to select a chief person out of every tribe and send them as spies into the Promised Land. The most celebrated of these were Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, of the tribe of Judah, and Joshua, the son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim. The names of the others are given, but nothing is recorded of them in history. Their instructions given to them by Moses were—"Get you up this way southward, and go up into the mountain, and see the land, what it is, and the people that dwell therein, whether they be strong or weak, few or many ; and what the land is that they dwell in, whether it be good or bad, and what cities they be that they dwell in, whether in tents or in strongholds ; and what the land is, whether it be fat or lean, whether there be wood therein or not. And be of good courage, and bring of the fruit of the land." The spies departed, and "reached the land from the Wilderness of Zin unto Rehob," elsewhere called Beth-rehob, in the north of the Promised Land within Mount Hermon, near the pass leading through that mountain to Hamath beyond, not far from Dan. It was the capital of a small Syrian kingdom, and continued such long after the city had fallen to the lot of Asher in the division of the land. From the description of their route it seems that the spies took a survey of the whole country from south to north, proceeding near Dan, otherwise the source of the Jordan, in their way out, and returning through the midst of the country along the borders of the Sidonians and Philistines. Moses tells us that the time when this reconnoitring party set out was "the time of the first ripe grapes," which intimates that it was in our August, when the first clusters come to maturity and are gathered, but

as the spies were absent forty days, the clusters which they procured at Eshcol when returning must have been of the second gathering, which takes place in September.

The spies, after an absence of forty days, just noticed, returned to Moses, bearing with them "a branch with one cluster of grapes, and they bare it between two upon a staff, and they brought of the pomegranates and the figs." This cluster must have been very large, but the circumstance of its being carried between two upon a staff is less an evidence of size than it is usually considered, for this mode of carriage was obviously adopted to prevent the bruising of the grapes, which were to be conveyed a considerable distance. Yet, notwithstanding the present comparative neglect of the vine in Palestine, it is allowed by various travellers that grapes in clusters of most extraordinary size are common; and the district in which the brook Eshcol is found, particularly the valley through which it flows, is still noted for the superiority of its grapes. The fruit astonished the Israelites, and the account of the country was no less gratifying; but the report of the inhabitants, and their strong and walled cities, completely depressed the people, and excited a dangerous mutiny. Caleb and Joshua boldly contradicted the report of their colleagues, and the former advised an immediate invasion, alleging that they were well able to conquer the country. This statement was again denied by their colleagues, who had no confidence in the promise and power of God, on which Caleb and Joshua relied, but measured all things by human strength. "The land," they said, "through which we have gone to search, it is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof; and all the people that we saw in it are men of great stature. And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants; and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight." The Rabbins think that the spies intended to describe the country

as very unhealthy, although fertile; and they consider them to have stated that wherever they came they saw the inhabitants burying the dead, as if there had been a plague among them. Some of the Rabbins even contend that there actually was a plague sent among the Canaanites to weaken them, and that the spies, instead of recognizing the divine intention, attributed it to the unwholesomeness of the country. As to the "men of a great stature"—the "giants, the sons of Anak"—it intimates that they were, as the Hebrew expresses it, *men of measures*, or above the ordinary standard, which could hardly be true of all the inhabitants, but can well apply, and would not be extraordinary even at the present time, to one particular family above the ordinary stature, who derived their name from Anak, the son of Arba. The spies therefore either made a false report, or an unfounded reference as to all the inhabitants from the sons of Anak, whom they had seen at or near the ancient city of Hebron, then called Kirjath-Arba.

It is evident, in whatever light we view it, that the spies, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, gave so alarming an account of the great stature, strength, and courage of the inhabitants, and of the strong position and fortification of their cities, that the Israelites were struck with consternation. A most dangerous insurrection broke out, and Moses and Aaron were in the greatest peril of being stoned by the people. Notwithstanding all that Caleb and Joshua could urge, the Israelites gave up the design of conquering Canaan in despair, and made preparations for returning to Egypt. They said one to another, "Let us make a captain, and let us return unto Egypt;" and it appears, from what Nehemiah states (ix. 17), that they actually appointed a leader for this purpose, which strikingly illustrates the debased state of their minds in thus preferring their former bondage to undergoing those privations and making those exertions which were required to establish and secure

their independence. The anger of Jehovah was kindled against them for their base ingratitude. They were saved from the most signal punishment by the intercession of Moses, but a divine decree was issued that all those, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, who were twenty years old and upwards, should die in Arabia Petrea, and that Canaan should be conquered by the next generation. Those spies who brought the false report were cut off by the plague, and the insurrection was happily extinguished. When we consider the many signs and wonders which Jehovah had manifested on their behalf, and how gloriously he had redeemed them, we cannot fail to recognize the wisdom and justice of that decree which shut them out from that rich inheritance they had so lightly esteemed. They were solemnly told that their "carcasses would fall in this wilderness," and that their "children would wander in the wilderness forty years." The Israelites now became sensible of their folly, and made an unsuccessful attempt to penetrate into the country. They attacked the Amalekites and Canaanites, who were in readiness to oppose them, notwithstanding the declaration of Moses, that the enterprise would not prosper. He told them not to go forward, lest they should fall into the ambuscades of their enemies, but to turn on the following morning and get into the wilderness by way of the Red Sea. Instead of obeying they persisted in their resolution, and the Amalekites and Canaanites "smote them, and discomfited them, even unto Hormah," thus becoming the instruments of punishing them for their mutiny and rebellion. But this ebullition of courage, even if it had been attended with success, would have been of short duration, and productive of no benefit. Their repulse taught them that they were not adequate to the conquest of the country, and they were compelled to acquiesce in a measure with which they would never have been satisfied, if they had not obtained this convincing proof of their own weakness.

With this sentence of death recorded

against the whole adult Hebrew host, with the exception of two individuals, they were turned back from the borders of the Promised Land to wander so many years longer in the Arabian deserts until that generation should become extinct. This long period was spent in traversing the wilds about Mount Seir. Besides the promulgation of a few additional laws the most remarkable event which occurred was the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, against the authority of Moses and Aaron, in which sad affair no fewer than fourteen thousand and seven hundred were slain by a plague. This melancholy insurrection is noticed in several articles in the present work. Moses briefly relates the history of this period, and at the close of the narration he enumerates all the places of encampment.

The new generation of the Israelites returned to Kadesh in the desert of Zin, where Miriam died in the fortieth year of their wandering, or the thirty-seventh, according to the Hebrew chronology, and though more courageous, they were scarcely less turbulent and rebellious than their fathers. During the long interval the Israelites appear to have repeatedly wandered to and fro, throughout the length and breadth of the desert region between Egypt, Judea, and Mount Sinai—a region which has ever retained the name of *El Tyh*, or the *Desert of Wandering*, in commemoration of the long sojourn of the Hebrews in it, and which is applied to the whole country—the mountains as well as the desert plains. Their period of wandering had now nearly expired, and their march once more assumed its original purport—the entering of Canaan. They encamped at Kadesh, where their water failed them, and their recollections of Egypt once more reviving, they repeated their usual reproaches against Moses for inducing them to leave that fertile country.—"Wherefore have ye made us to come up out of Egypt to bring us unto this evil place? It is no place of reed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates; neither is there any water to

drink." Moses was ordered to strike a rock with his rod, and water would be procured in the same manner as at Meribah or Marah on a former occasion. Pococke informs us that "in one of the roads from the convent of Sinai to Suez there is exactly such another stone as the rock of Marah, with the same sort of openings all down, and the signs where the water ran. The Arabs say that it is likewise called the *stone of Moses*, and that this must be the Kadesh-Meribah which Moses smote twice, and the waters came out abundantly, after they had returned into those parts from Ezeon Geber."

The important transaction at Meribah is worthy of particular notice, because Moses and Aaron, having manifested some impatience or distrust of the Divine command on this occasion, received an intimation that they would not be permitted to enter the Promised Land, and the grief which the former felt for this deprivation is evident from his humble and repeated supplications to Jehovah to reverse the sentence. Moses gathered the people before the rock, and addressed them—"Hear, now, ye rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock?" The manner in which Bishop Hall paraphrases this question rather happily explains what follows:—"Hear, now, ye rebels, is it likely that we shall fetch water out of this hard rock to satisfy your thirst? This we are required to do, but is this a thing possible to be done?" We are told that in consequence of this distrust in the divine power, the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron—"Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them."

The Edomites were requested by Moses, who reminded them of their relationship to the Israelites as descendants of Esau, the twin-brother of Jacob, to allow their *brethren* to pass freely through their territories, but they refused, notwithstanding the solemn assurance of Moses that they would pay for every

thing they required, and that they would not turn to the "right hand or to the left."

While in this rocky region of the ancient country of Seir, now Petra, the capital of the Edomites, Aaron was led by Moses and Eleazar to the summit of Mount Hor, and there divested of the pontifical robes, which were put on his son and successor. Aaron was immediately "gathered to his people," or died on Mount Hor, where he was buried by Moses and Eleazar before they descended to the encampment. The death of Miriam is already noticed. Eusebius describes her tomb as being shown in his time at Kadesh, near Petra, the capital of Arabia Petræa.

The refusal of the Edomites to allow a free passage through their country into the southern part of Canaan compelled the Israelites to take a more circuitous route, which occasioned fresh discontent, and their murmurings and complaints rose so high, that an extraordinary chastisement was necessary to reduce them to obedience. They indulged in their usual allusions to Egypt; and in addition to their privations, occasioned by the want of water and what they considered indifferently bread, they were "much discouraged because of the way." Their conduct excited the indignation of Jehovah, who "sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people, and much people of Israel died." It is not agreed whether the epithet *fiery* (*seraphim*) is given to these serpents on account of their brilliant appearance, or on account of the burning agony caused by their bites or stings. The latter opinion is sanctioned by the Septuagint, the rendering in which is *deadly serpents*; and the Arabic version renders the intimation, *serpents of burning bites*. It is to be observed that no creation of serpents to punish the Israelites was required; but they were collected probably in extraordinary numbers, and endued with a stronger propensity than usual to assault all persons who fell in their way. This view of the calamity is supported by what is said of the region through which

the Israelites were now passing in another place (Deut. viii. 15), with a particular reference to what occurred in it—"The great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and droughts, where there was no water." This description, we are told by travellers, answers to this day with remarkable precision to those desert regions, and particularly to that part about the head of the Gulf of Akaba where the Israelites now were—scorpions being particularly common, and inflicting a wound scarcely less burning than the serpents of the same region. Burckhardt, who, when he made the observation, was on the western coast of the gulf, and nearly opposite to where the Israelites are supposed to have been, informs us—"Ayd told me that serpents were very common in these parts—that the fishermen were much afraid of them, and extinguished their fires in the evening before they went to sleep, because the light was known to attract them. As serpents, then, are so numerous on this side, they are probably not deficient towards the head of the gulf on its opposite shore, where it appears that the Israelites passed when they journeyed from Mount Hor by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the Land of Edom, and when the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people." Laborde also bears witness to the extraordinary number of serpents found about the head of the gulf, but neither he nor Burckhardt speaks particularly of the species.

The Israelites were soon brought to a sense of their folly, and acknowledged the justice of the divine procedure against them. "We have sinned," they said to Moses, "for we have spoken against the Lord, and against thee; pray unto the Lord, that he take away the serpents from us." It pleased God, through an agency which divine power only could make efficient, to heal those who had been wounded, or dying of their wounds. Moses was commanded to "make a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole, and it shall come to pass that every one that is

bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live." This was done, and "it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass he lived." The brazen serpent made by Moses on this remarkable occasion was preserved as a memorial of this great miracle till the time of Hezekiah, when it was destroyed, in consequence of its having become an object of idolatrous reverence. The author of the Book of Wisdom imputes the virtue of the serpent to its right cause. "He that turned himself toward it was not saved by the thing which he saw, but by Thee, that art the Saviour of all;" and he appropriately designates it a *sign* or *symbol* of salvation, to put them in remembrance of the commandment of the Law. It is almost unnecessary to remind the reader that it was an illustrious type of our Saviour, and particularly of his death upon the cross, to redeem men from the sting or sharpness of death, and from the power of that indefatigable enemy of the human race who is emphatically called the Old Serpent.

The Israelites passed along the frontiers of the Edomites, and crossed the brook Zared or Zered, supposed to be the river Ahsa, the largest of several streams which flow into the back water at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. They then proceeded northerly through the territory of the Moabites to the river Arnon, which is now understood to be the *Modjeb*, a stream dividing the province of Belka from that of Kerek, as it formerly divided the kingdoms of the Moabites and Canaanites, and falling into the Dead Sea after a course of about fifty miles, a few miles below the north-eastern extremity of that great scene of desolation. Sihon, king of the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan, opposed the progress of the Israelites, but they were signally defeated by Moses, and their whole country, from the Arnon to Mount Hermon, fell into the power of the victors. The Moabites and the Ammonites saw the defeat of their old enemies the Amorites with pleasure, but they regarded

with suspicious dread their new and more powerful neighbours the Hebrews. The history of Balaam and Balak is here introduced by Moses, and forms an interesting episode, which is narrated in another place (see BALAAM). The Amorites, however, as Jahn observes, had, in reality, nothing to fear, for the Hebrew law prohibited all hostilities against them. "They nevertheless united with some Midianitish tribes who were at that time pasturing their herds in the country of the Amorites, but with this accession to their strength they ventured on no open acts of hostility. After the failure of repeated attempts to curse the Hebrews by means of Balaam, the allied nations at length succeeded in reducing them to idolatry. As this was, in fact, instigating the people to rebellion against their lawful sovereign, the Moabites and Amorites might have been justly punished by the war which was prosecuted against Midian; but they were spared because they were related to the Hebrews, and on condition that they would remain quiet for the future. The Hebrews were now separated from Canaan by nothing but the river Jordan. The conquest of the country was next to be undertaken. For this purpose the new generation of soldiers was mustered and reviewed, and the number of men capable of bearing arms found to be nearly the same as at the former enrolment. The tribes of Reuben and Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, received for their possession from Moses the conquered country east of the Jordan; but they were required to assist the other tribes in the conquest of Canaan before they settled on their own lands. Finally, the boundaries of the country to be subdued were accurately defined, the order for the expulsion of the inhabitants was repeated and enforced, and the regulations respecting the cities of refuge were established. With this business was completed that with which Moses had been entrusted as the internuncio between God and the Hebrews."

Our attention must now be briefly directed to the last acts of the illustrious

leader of the Israelites. His death was announced to him by Jehovah, and the cause again repeated of his being prevented to enter the Promised Land, but he was to be permitted to view it from the place appointed for his death. He entreated God to appoint his successor, that "the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd;" and he was ordered to take Joshua, to place him before Eleazar the high priest, to give him a charge in the sight of the Israelites, and to lay his hands upon him. Having discharged this duty, and commissioned Joshua as a military leader, divinely appointed to be the conqueror of Canaan, and to portion it out among the victors, the official duties of Moses were closed. He delivered to the priests the whole book of the Law, that they might deposit it in the sanctuary with the ark of the covenant. His exhortations, which chiefly compose his Fifth Book, called Deuteronomy, or *the repetition of the law*, he delivered to the magistrates as his farewell address, at a time when their minds were well prepared to receive instruction by the accomplishment of the divine promises which had already commenced. This Book, which contains a period of only about two months, is a connected recapitulation, for the instruction of the new generation, of the laws and ordinances which had been formerly and at various intervals delivered, but it also contains various particulars which do not occur in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Although, therefore, the Book of Deuteronomy is in substance no other than a compendium of the other Books of the Pentateuch, yet the frequently new matter, the additional details which are often given, and even the varied form in which the same narrative is expressed, render it of the greatest importance, and a most valuable commentary on the three preceding Books. It opens with an interesting address to the Israelites by its illustrious and inspired author, in which he briefly recapitulates the many circumstances wherein they had experienced the Divine favour

since their departure from Horeb. He describes the success and victories which had marked their progress, their incredulous murmurs and ingratitude, and the effects of the wrath of Jehovah, by which he had been himself prevented from entering that country long promised to their fathers. He proceeds with the most animated zeal to exhort them to future obedience, and he rehearses, in a discourse renewed at intervals, the various commandments, statutes, and judgments which had been delivered to them by God, that they might become a "wise and understanding nation," and fulfil the terms of that covenant which God had made with them in Horeb. While Moses intersperses with these laws frequent reproaches for their past misconduct, he unfolds the glorious attributes of Jehovah, and reiterates every persuasive motive to obedience. He commands them to distinguish their first entrance into Canaan by a public display of reverence for God's Law; and, that latest generations might have a visible and permanent memorial of their duty, he directed that the fundamental principles of the Law should be engraven on pillars of stone plastered with lime, and that these pillars should be erected with appropriate solemnities at Shechem on Mount Ebal, or more probably Mount Gerizim. On this occasion the priests were to utter particular imprecations against all the secret transgressors of the Law, to which the people were to assent by responding *Amen* at the close of each imprecation. He then renewed the covenant with the people, which not only included that previously made at Horeb, but ratified those assurances of spiritual blessings long before imparted to Abraham and his descendants. He developed "a second time," says Professor Jahn, "and still more minutely than before, the conditions according to which Jehovah, their God and King, would govern them. He cast a prophetic glance into the most distant futurity, while he declared the different destinies that awaited them to the latest generations, according

to their conduct in regard to the Law. In full view of these conditions, and to impress them more deeply on their minds, he caused the whole people, even the women and children, again to make a solemn oath of obedience, and that not only for themselves, but for their posterity."

The conclusion of the life of Moses evinces that his last days were distinguished by increasing solicitude and by the most active exertions for the welfare of the Israelites. His prophecies increase in number and clearness towards the close of his writings, and as he approached the end of his life he appears to have discerned futurity with more exactness. He composed a psalm or ode, in which the substance of his addresses is expressed in the most animating and eloquent language, and which has always been regarded as an inimitable piece of ancient poetry. "Its opening," says Bishop Lowth, "is singularly elegant and magnificent, its whole arrangement or structure is regular, easy, and adapted to the nature of the subject in an order nearly historical. It embraces an incredible variety of the most important topics—the truth and justice of God, His fatherly affection, and most unwearied loving-kindness towards his chosen people, and the ungrateful and rebellious disposition of that people in return. The heat of the Divine displeasure, and its most alarming menaces, delivered in a noble personification, equal in grandeur any thing which exists in the choicest treasures of poetry; at the same time it represents those very tides of indignation occasionally moderated by kindness and compassion, and terminated at length in promises and in consolation. Not to dwell on the loftiness of the sentiments, the impetuosity of the passions, and the force of the figures and the language, such is the nature of the subject that it imitates much of the style and colouring of the prophetic poetry, so that to all the vigour, and animation, and spirited boldness of the ode, it unites that distinguished variety and grandeur of imagery

which is peculiar to the prophetic manner."

Moses caused this sublime ode to be read before all the people, and he then delivered it to Joshua, to be afterwards learnt by them, and transmitted to their posterity. The last transaction of Moses with the Israelites was to summon them to receive his final farewell, and his prophetic blessing to the people in general, and to each tribe in particular. As soon as he had done so he ascended alone the mountain called Nebo or Pisgah, in the range called Abarim, which extends southward from the mountains of Gilead perhaps to the Arnon, and probably still southwards to the mountains of Seir. It is impossible to determinate the extent of this mountainous range at the present day, nor is it of any material consequence in a geographical point of view. As it is stated in one place that Moses died on Mount Nebo, and in another passage on Mount Pisgah, it is clear that Nebo is a mountain in the range of the Abarim, and Pisgah is the most elevated and commanding peak of that mountain. Nebo is now usually identified with Mount Attarous, about ten miles north of the Arnon, and the same distance from the Dead Sea. It is a barren mountain, the most elevated in the neighbourhood, and its summit is distinguished by a heap of stones. From this mountain the Lord showed his servant Moses "all the land of Gilead, even to Dan; and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the utmost sea; and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar." It must have been a most cheering prospect in those early times, and one which would amply repay Moses for all his exertions, when Canaan was literally a land flowing with milk and honey—to see the green hills and the fertile valleys of, now desolated and wretched country. The illustrious Hebrew lawgiver never returned to the Israelites. He died on the mountain in the one hundred and twentieth year of his age, yet his mental

faculties were entire, and neither his eyesight nor his natural vigour was in the least impaired. The place of his death, or rather the disposal of his body, has ever remained a mysterious secret. We are told that Jehovah "buried him in a valley in the Land of Moab, over against Beth-Peor, but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." Josephus and some other Jewish writers assert that Moses was snatched away in a cloud while conversing with Joshua and Eleazar, but this is directly opposed to the statement in the text, that he died and was buried. Several commentators, both Jewish and Christian, understand that he was buried by angels at God's command; but these and similar opinions are mere conjectures. In the middle of the seventeenth century some Maronite shepherds discovered a tomb near Mount Nebo, bearing an inscription in Hebrew—"Moses, the servant of the Lord," and this or a similar tomb is still shown in the neighbourhood; but a Jewish Rabbín proved convincingly that this must be the tomb of some other Moses, and the discovery has been deservedly treated as unworthy of credit. The Israelites mourned for their great leader thirty days, and probably discovered the loss they had sustained when he, whom they had so often treated with ingratitude, was no more. His death was announced by Jehovah to Joshua—"Moses my servant is dead," so that there was no human witness of his decease. Notwithstanding his high situation as leader and lawgiver of the Israelites, he left his sons without rank or patrimony, as private Levites to subsist on the national bounty, in common with their brethren. It is remarkable that his grandson Jonathan, the son of Gershom, and his family, became idolatrous priests to the Danites until the capture of the ark by the Philistines, as recorded in the Book of Judges (xviii. 30); and the Masorite doctors, to conceal this disgrace to his memory, changed *Moses* into *Manasses*, by interpolating a letter (n) in the present copies of the Hebrew text. The posterity of his other son Eliezer were

numerous in the time of Solomon, and some of them were high in office, 1 Chron. xxiii. 14, 17; xxvi. 24, 25. "Thus," says a writer, "with the death of this eminent Prophet and Lawgiver endeth the *Pentateuch*, containing the sacred history of the world, of mankind in general, and of the Abrahamic family in particular, for the first two thousand five hundred and fifty-three years—namely, from the Creation to the arrival of the Israelites in the Land of Canaan."—"By the institutions," says Jahn, "which he introduced for the preservation of the knowledge of God, he conferred an invaluable favour not only on the Hebrews, but on the whole human race—a favour for which no wise and good man can withhold from him his gratitude, whatever objections he may imagine can be brought against some of his laws."

It is generally agreed that the *Pentateuch*, or First Five Books of the Old Testament, were written by Moses, except the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which is supposed to have been composed by Joshua and added by Ezra. Dr Geddes contends that the *Pentateuch* first appeared in its present form in the reign of Solomon, and he imagines that the Books were compiled from the journals of Moses and other ancient documents. Moses is also stated to have been the author or at least the compiler of the Book of Job, and some ascribe to him eleven of the Psalms—from the 90th to the 100th inclusive. Dr Geddes, speaking of the very great excellence of the *Pentateuch* in composition only, says—"I know not if it would be too much to affirm that whether they be considered as a compendium of history, or as a digest of laws, or as a system of theology, or as models of good writing, they are in some respects unequalled, in none overmatched, by the best productions of ancient times."

It has been justly remarked by an ingenious writer, that "they who suppose Moses himself to have been the author of the institutions, civil or religious, that bear his name, and that in framing them he borrowed much from the Egyptians

or other nations—must never have compared them together, otherwise they could not but have perceived many circumstances in which they differed most essentially from them all." It would of course far exceed the limits of the present work, and in some respect would be foreign to a biographical article, to enter into a minute analysis, inquiry, and investigation of the institutions of Moses. It may, and perhaps must, be granted, that a correspondence exists between some of the Mosaic ordinances and the customs of other people, and some of these ordinances can be admirably illustrated by references to these customs; but that they were derived from the practices of idolatrous nations is at once inconsistent and absurd. It will be manifest from a careful examination, in which the most profound knowledge of the history of antiquity may be brought into operation to any extent, that the laws of Moses are truly *original*, and, consequently, as no heathen or unassisted person could ever conceive an idea of so great an object as the Mosaic Institutions, the whole examination would the more certainly convince us that Moses truly was, according to his own declarations, *only the instrument of* JEHOVAH. For when we consider the undoubted objects of the Mosaic Institutions—which were undeniably the subsequent instruction of mankind in the great doctrine of the unity and moral government of God, as the Creator of the world and the common Parent of all the human race, in opposition to the polytheism and idolatry then prevalent, which, besides being grossly absurd in its principles, and leading to endless superstitions, threatened the world with a deluge of vice and misery—when we consider these evident objects, among others, of the Mosaic Institutions, it will at once be admitted that the appeal of Moses, thus taught of God, to the Israelites, can fear neither detection nor contradiction. "Behold!" says the inspired lawgiver, "I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that you should do so in the

land whither ye go to possess it. Keep, therefore, and do them, for this is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this Law, which I set before you this day?"

There are many traditions of Moses, preserved by the Orientals, which are of great interest and curiosity. Many of their statements are different from his own narrative of events, but they all tend to show the reality of the transactions recorded. So numerous are these traditions that a life of Moses could be written from them alone. It is unnecessary to dwell on the character of this illustrious man. It is brought prominently forward throughout his whole history, and is set before us in a manner the most elevated and dignified. Wherever he is noticed in the inspired record it is in the highest language of praise, as one of the greatest men of ancient times, and one of the most distinguished persons of sacred history. Volumes have been written on his life, character, and institutions, and yet

the subject and the inquiry are inexhaustible. By his own nation Moses has ever been held in the greatest honour, as a man who, to quote the language of the son of Sirach, was "beloved of God and men, whose memorial is blessed." By other nations who are blessed with the knowledge of divine truth he has been always equally appreciated, as one of the greatest benefactors of the human race—as the divinely commissioned messenger of God, by whose institutions the Israelites, chosen by Omnipotent Wisdom for the greatest and best of purposes, were properly disciplined to a system, which served as a "schoolmaster" to bring men to Christ. With the utmost propriety, therefore, does the son of Sirach say of this holy seer, that Jehovah "made him like to the glorious saints, and magnified him, so that his enemies stood in fear of him. By his words he caused the wonders to cease, and he made him glorious in the sight of kings; and gave him a commandment for his people, and showed him part of His glory. He sanctified him in his faithfulness and meekness, and chose him out of all men. He made him to hear His voice, and gave him commandment before His face, even the law of life and knowledge, that he might teach Jacob his covenants, and Israel his judgments."

N

NAAMAN, the "captain of the host of the king of Syria," is described as a "great man with his master, and honourable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance to Syria." Of the history of this distinguished person, apart from the transaction recorded in the Second Book of Kings, nothing is known. He filled the most important office in the Syrian dominions—his personal bravery had been conspicuous on many occasions; but he was afflicted with a disorder which greatly deteriorated from the advantages of

his high situation—he was a leper. His leprosy, it is probable, did not exclude him from society in a country where the Jewish Law was not in operation, but it was a great calamity to him, and, as no cure for it was known, it was likely to have proved fatal. It happened that a Jewish maiden, taken captive in some of the Syrian incursions into Judea, who acted as an attendant to Naaman's wife, observed the distress of the Syrian general, and expressed a wish to her mistress—"Would God my lord were with the

prophet that is in Samaria, for he would recover him of his leprosy." The saying was repeated to Naaman, and also to the king of Syria, who, anxious for the recovery of his favourite general, exclaimed—"Go to, go, and I will send a letter to the king of Israel." Naaman was made the bearer of it in person, and took with him "ten talents of silver, and six thousand pieces of gold, and ten changes of raiment."

Ahab's son Jehoram was at this time on the throne of the Ten Tribes at Samaria. When Naaman arrived in that city and delivered the letter of his own sovereign, in which it was simply requested that he (Jehoram) would recover the noble Syrian from his malady, the king of Israel evinced the utmost grief and consternation. "Am I God," he exclaimed, "to kill and make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy? wherefore consider, I pray you, and see how he seeketh a quarrel against me." Jehoram had forsaken the true God, and thought neither of his almighty power nor of his prophet. He viewed the request as a snare to involve him in a quarrel, from which he could in no way extricate himself without the certainty of becoming involved in a war with his powerful neighbour. The Prophet Elisha was informed of the king's distress, and he sent a messenger to the palace, urging the king to send the Syrian general to him, and he would know that there was a prophet in Israel. Naaman came with his chariot and attendants to the door of the house of Elisha, who, instead of waiting on the Syrian general in person, simply sent a messenger to him with the announcement and intimation—"Go, and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." It was not inconsistent for Elisha, as Stackhouse observes, to take some state upon him, and to support the character and dignity of a prophet of the most high God, especially as this might be a means of raising the honour of his religion and ministry, and of giving Naaman

a more suitable idea of his miraculous cure, when he found that it was effected neither by the prayer nor the presence of the prophet, but by the Divine power and goodness.

Naaman received the prophet's directions with the utmost contempt and rage. He said that he expected the prophet to come out to him, and "stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper;" and as to the water of Jordan he exclaimed—"Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?" He turned, and went away in indignation; but the language of reason, expressed by his attendants in kindness and affection, calmed the anger of the noble Syrian, and he at length obeyed Elisha's directions, by which he was completely cured. In gratitude for such a signal favour, he returned to the Prophet, acknowledged that he was now convinced there was no god in all the earth like the God of Israel, and requested him to accept a token of his gratitude. Elisha, however, positively refused, and resisted all his entreaties. The Syrian general then said—"Shall there not, then, I pray thee, be given to thy servant two mules' burden of earth? for thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord. In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house [or temple] of Rimmon; when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing." The obvious import of this request is, that he intended to employ the earth in erecting an altar on which he would sacrifice exclusively to the God of Israel, and he was anxious to have it constructed of the soil of a country wherein Jehovah was peculiarly present. Being now a worshipper of the true God, Naaman requested permission to attend his master in a civil capacity only in the

temple of the Syrian deity Rimmon, and the prophet offered no objection, as, when so engaged, he was performing his duty to his own sovereign. Elisha replied, "Go in peace."

The conduct of Gehazi in following Naaman, and covetously procuring some of the valuable presents to himself, by a false tale in the name of Elisha, concludes the narrative of Naaman's interview with the Prophet of Israel. The leprosy of Naaman was transferred to Gehazi and his posterity, as a punishment for his falsehood, and dissimulation; but of this the Syrian general was probably ignorant. He is not subsequently mentioned in the sacred history, except casually in the Gospel by St Luke (iv. 27). NAAMAN is also the name of a son of Benjamin, Gen. xvi. 21; and of a son of Bela, Num. xxvi. 40.

NABAL. See DAVID.

NABOTH. See AHAZ.

NADAB. See AARON.

NAHASIL. See DAVID.

NAHUM, one of the twelve Minor Prophets, flourished from the years B.C. 720 to 698, probably towards the close of Hezekiah's reign. He designates himself an Elkoshite, which some have considered a patronymic expression, intimating that he was a descendant of Elkosh, but it is generally supposed that he was a native of Elkosh or Elkosha, a small village in Galilee, of which Jerome says that he saw the ruins. Josephus places him in the reign of Jotham, and that his predictions were accomplished one hundred and fifteen years afterwards. Nothing is known of this Prophet, or of the time of his death, but his tomb, or pretended tomb, was formerly shown at a village near Emmaus. The fire, spirit, and sublimity of Nahum are unequalled, and his scenes are painted with great variety and splendour. The opening of his Prophecy, in which he describes the attributes of God, is truly majestic, and the allegorical pictures which the Book contains are remarkably beautiful. Bishop Lowth considers the Prophecy of Nahum as a complete and perfect poem,

of which the conduct and imagery are admirable.

NAOMI. See BOAZ and RUTH.

NATHAN, the name of several persons mentioned in the Books of the Old Testament, of whom the most distinguished was the prophet who flourished in the reigns of David and Solomon. See DAVID.

NATHANAEL, whom our Saviour pronounced to be an "Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile," is thought to be the same as Bartholomew, one of the Twelve Apostles. He knew from the prophecies that Christ was to be born at Bethlehem, but he doubted even the possibility of any good thing coming out of Nazareth, where he at first concluded our Saviour had been born, but he was soon undeceived in that supposition, and declared Christ to be the "Son of God," the "King of Israel." See BARTHOLOMEW.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR I., or NABUCHODONOSOR, the title of several kings of Babylon, which appears to have been as commonly given to their kings as Pharaoh was the royal title of the Egyptian monarchs; at least the Jews called all the princes by this name who reigned beyond the Euphrates. The first mentioned in point of chronology is the prince called Nabuchodonosor in the Apocryphal Books of Tobit and Judith, whose real name appears to have been Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar the Great. This Nabopolassar destroyed the Assyrian and founded the Chaldeæ-Babylonian empire, which is also sometimes called the Assyrian in the Scriptures and frequently by the Greek writers, in the year, it is said, B.C. 623, having some time previously established his throne at Babylon. In the year B.C. 611, Nabopolassar had made himself so formidable that Pharaoh-Necho, the great monarch of Egypt, exerted all his power to check his progress. At that time Josiah, king of Judah, was in alliance with Nabopolassar, and on this account he would not allow Necho to pass through his territories. A battle

was in consequence fought at Megiddo, in which Necho was victorious, and Josiah was slain.

In the third year after the battle of Megiddo, Necho undertook a second expedition against Nabopolassar, with a numerous army drawn in part from Western Africa, Libya, and Ethiopia. Berosus relates that Nabopolassar, also called Nebuchadnezzar I., was at this time aged and infirm, and that he gave the command of a part of the army to his son, the celebrated Nebuchadnezzar, who reigned conjointly with his father during the latter years of his father's life. This is evident from what is stated in the Books of Jeremiah and Daniel. In the historical portion of the Book of Daniel it is said, that "in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem, and besieged it." Now Jeremiah makes the *first year* of Nebuchadnezzar to coincide with the *fourth year* of Jehoiakim, and thence begins the date of the *seventy years'* captivity, Jer. xxvi. 1; but Daniel speaks of Nebuchadnezzar as king of Babylon in the third year of Jehoiakim. In explanation it may be observed, that Daniel begins his computation from the time that Nebuchadnezzar was sent by his father against Necho, which was toward the end of the third year of Jehoiakim. In the beginning of the following year he conquered the Egyptians, which was the fourth year of Jehoiakim; and in the latter end of the same year he came and besieged Jerusalem, at which time Jehoiakim became tributary to the king of Babylon, and consequently the seventy years of captivity and vassalage to Babylon commenced. Again, Daniel places Nebuchadnezzar's celebrated dream in the second year of his reign, which is the Babylonian computation, or the fourth according to the Jewish, namely, the second year of his reigning alone, or the fourth of his reigning jointly with his father. Daniel evidently follows the computation of time in use among the Chaldeans.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR II. or the GREAT, son of the preceding, defeated the Egyptians at Carchemish, or Circesium, on the Euphrates, and drove Pharaoh-Necho out of Asia. After the death of Josiah, who had been slain by the Egyptians at Megiddo, Judah fell into the hands of the victors, and Necho, who had marched to Jerusalem after the conquest of Phœnicia, deposed Jehoahaz, the younger son of Josiah, whom the people had elevated to the throne, and placed Eleakim, the elder son of Josiah, on the throne, to whom he gave the name of Jehoiakim. This prince was a vassal of Egypt, and Nebuchadnezzar, after defeating the Egyptians, marched directly to Jerusalem, which surrendered, after a short siege. The Babylonian conqueror permitted Jehoiakim to possess the crown, but he took part of the ornaments of the Temple as booty, and carried with him to Babylon several young men of distinction, among whom were Daniel and his three friends, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, to be employed in the service of his court, and at the same time to answer the purpose of hostages. This was the commencement of the Babylonian sovereignty over Judah, or the Babylonian captivity, which Jeremiah predicted was to continue seventy years. This was in the year B. C. 607, or B. C. 606, according to Usher, whose computation has been generally received, and the small difference of one year is of little moment.

Three years afterwards Jehoiakim, who probably expected assistance from Egypt, rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar. On this part of Scripture history Professor Jahn has some observations which are worthy of attention. "It is said in the Book of Kings that Jehovah sent the Chaldeans, Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, against Judah—that Jehoiakim died—and that Jehoiakim his son ascended the throne. But in the Chronicles nothing is said of the rebellion, it being merely stated that Nebuchadnezzar came up against Jehoiakim, bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon.

It is plain that some gross error has crept into the Book of Chronicles by means of transcribers." It is certain, however, that Nebuchadnezzar placed Mattaniah, a brother of Jehoiakim, on the vacant throne, giving him the name of Zedekiah. This prince chose to renounce his vassalage to Babylon in the eleventh year of his reign, and to make an alliance with Pharaoh-hophra, king of Egypt, which induced the Chaldeans again to besiege Jerusalem. The Egyptians marched to relieve the city, but when Nebuchadnezzar advanced against them they retreated to Egypt without hazarding a battle. The siege was then resumed, the city taken, and Zedekiah was made prisoner in his flight, and carried to Nebuchadnezzar. Nebuzar-adan, the commander of the royal guard, stripped the Temple of every thing valuable, set fire to the city, and threw down the fortifications. The principal inhabitants were put to death, and the rest were forced to go into exile. Nebuchadnezzar appointed a Hebrew named Gedaliah to be governor of the peasantry who were allowed to remain, and those few persons of distinction who chose to return received a solemn assurance from the new governor that they would be unmolested if they maintained their allegiance to the king of Babylon. Gedaliah was soon afterwards murdered by Ishmael, a member of the royal house, who, dreading the vengeance of the Chaldeans, escaped with his associates to Egypt. About four years afterwards Nebuzar-adan carried off into captivity the few inhabitants who remained, and the country was entirely depopulated, with the exception of the nomade tribes who wandered through it, and the Idumeans who were settled in some of the southern parts.

Nebuchadnezzar, called Nabocholassar by Ptolemy, and Nebuchodonosor by the Greeks, succeeded his father as sole sovereign in the year B. C. 607 or 606. It was in the second year of his reign, according to the Babylonian computation, or the fourth, according to the Jewish, that his celebrated dream occurred, preg-

nant with historical events, which Daniel interpreted, and for which he was promoted to "be ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon." (See DANIEL). In the second year after the total destruction of Jerusalem, and supposed about the year B. C. 586, Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to the celebrated city of Tyre. This siege continued thirteen years, when he gained possession of the city and destroyed it, but not till it had been deserted by the inhabitants, who contrived to escape with their treasures by sea. During this long siege the neighbouring cities suffered severely. The fugitive Tyrians afterwards returned and built a new city on an island about four stadia from the ancient Tyre, which was destined to fall in a subsequent century before the victorious arms of Alexander the Great.

Having reduced Tyre, the Babylonian conqueror marched against Egypt, and made himself master of the whole country without much difficulty. Megasthenes, quoted by Josephus, says that he then laid waste a great part of Africa, penetrated to Spain, and in the greatness of his exploits he excelled Hercules himself. Strabo says that Sesostris, king of Egypt, and Tearcon (Taracon, or Tirhakah), king of the Ethiopians, extended their expeditions as far as Europe; but Nebuchadnezzar, who is venerated by the Chaldeans even more than Hercules is by the Greeks, went not only to the Pillars of Hercules (for so far, according to Megasthenes, had Tearcon penetrated), but marched through Spain to Thrace and Pontus. The same events are related by Eusebius, and there can be little doubt that this ancient Oriental conqueror, the remains of whose once magnificent capital strikingly verify the truth of prophecy, traversed part of Europe.

Enriched in his Egyptian expedition by the spoils of the conquered, when Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon he employed his wealth in maintaining the temples and in augmenting the splendour of his seat of empire. He erected a royal

castle near the splendid temple of Belus, on the other side of the Euphrates, and surrounded the whole of that suburb, which may be called a new city, with brick walls of vast height and thickness. Various other works of great utility and prodigious labour are mentioned as having been undertaken by him, some of which were afterwards ascribed to the fabled Semiramis, and it has also been said that they were finished by Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, the last of the Babylonian monarchs. It is certain that he made Babylon one of the most magnificent cities of antiquity, and that his proud exclamation was not an empty boast—"Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my powers, and for the honour of my majesty?"

Nebuchadnezzar, according to Berosus as quoted by Josephus, was "attacked by a disease, and died in the forty-third year of his reign." This disease must have been something remarkable, otherwise it would not have obtained such a prominent notice. Eusebius relates a Chaldean tradition from Abydenus, that Nebuchadnezzar, after enlarging and ornamenting Babylon, pronounced on the roof of his palace a prophecy respecting the conquest of the city by the Medes and Persians, and then disappeared. This tradition is evidently made up from his prophetic dreams and his insanity, during which he withdrew from human society, and resided among wild beasts. Jerome mentions a Jewish tradition, that his son and successor, Evil-Merodach, administered the affairs of the government during his insanity, which he did in such a faulty manner, that on his restoration to reason he threw the prince into prison. It is, however, in the Book of Daniel that we find the true account of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity, which continued seven years, its causes, and its consequences; and Bishop Horsley contends that the chapter which contains it (the fourth), or at least the latter part of it, was not written by Daniel, but by the king himself, when, at the end of

the time specified, upon his recovery he published a proclamation in every part of his vast empire, giving an account of all which had befallen him, and giving praise and honour to the King of heaven, acknowledging that "all his works are truth, and his ways judgment, and that those who walk in pride he is able to abase." On this interesting and instructive part of Nebuchadnezzar's history, Bishop Horsley has some eloquent and forcible observations:—"We shall not find in history," says that truly learned writer, "a more awful example and monument of Providence than the vicissitudes of Nebuchadnezzar's life afford. Raised gradually to the pinnacle of power and human glory by a long train of those brilliant actions and successes which man is too apt to ascribe to himself—the proximate causes being indeed in himself, and in the instruments he uses, although Providence is always the prime efficient—he was suddenly cast down from it, and after a time as suddenly restored, without any natural or human means. His humiliation was not the effect of any reverse of fortune, of any public disaster, or any mismanagement of the affairs of his empire. At the expiration of a twelvemonth from his dream, the king, still at rest in his house and flourishing in his palace, surveying his city, and exulting in the monument of his own greatness which it presented to his eye, was smitten by an invisible hand. As the event stood unconnected with any known natural cause, it must have been beyond the ken of any foresight short of the Divine, and it follows incontestably that the prediction and the accomplishment of it were both from God. The king's restoration to power and grandeur had also been predicted, and this took place at the predicted time independently of any natural cause, and without the use of any human means." His condition during the seven years of his insanity is strikingly described. He was "driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown

s' *feathers*, and his nails like birds' *claws*." It will here be observed, that the words *feathers* and *claws*, being printed in *italics*, are supplied, and are not in the original. In the proclamation which Nebuchadnezzar issued when he recovered he gives his own testimony to the fact, and demonstrates the truth of the prediction, his fall and his restoration, while he humbly acknowledges the greatness of Him who "doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay His hand, or say unto him, What doest thou? At the same time," he continues, "my reason returned unto me, and for the glory of my kingdom, mine honour and brightness returned unto me; and my counsellors and my lords sought unto me; and I was established in my kingdom, and excellent majesty was added unto me."

Nothing further is recorded of Nebuchadnezzar in the Scriptures, and in the Book of Daniel we are immediately introduced to the impious feast of Belshazzar his grandson, and the overthrow of the Babylonian empire by the Persians. The character of this ancient conqueror is represented in rather a favourable light, and he was an eminent instrument in the hands of Jehovah to fulfil his divine arrangements. His conduct in casting the three young Hebrews into the furnace which he ordered to be heated "seven times more than it was wont," because they would not worship the golden image of Bel, or of some other Assyrian deity which he capriciously set up, is a remarkable illustration of Oriental despotism, as is his threat of instant death to the wise men of Babylon if they did not discover and interpret his dreams which he had forgotten. On both occasions he was compelled to acknowledge the greatness of Jehovah, and the generosity of his disposition is exhibited in the rewards he bestowed on Daniel, and on the three Hebrews who had been miraculously preserved before his eyes. In a proclamation which he issued, he confessed the power of the only living and

true God, and he was thus the instrument of preserving the knowledge of the truth throughout the idolatrous nations which formed his vast empire. His edict is short but sufficiently expressive. "Peace be multiplied unto you. I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me. How great are his signs, and how mighty are his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation."

NEHEMIAH, a most distinguished and truly patriotic governor of the Jews, was the son of Hachaliah, supposed to have been of the tribe of Levi, and was born at Shushan during the Captivity. His father, according to Dr Prideaux, appears to have been one of those Jews who, having obtained a comfortable settlement in the country of their captivity, chose to remain rather than return to his native place when permission was granted. The father of Nehemiah must have been a person of some consequence in Shushan, and we accordingly find the distinguished man now before us promoted to the important office of cup-bearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, which caused him to be daily in the king's presence, and enabled him to obtain the special favour of Esther the queen of that monarch. The Hebrew colony in Judea was admirably regulated by Ezra, the governor appointed by the Persian king (see EZRA), but the ravages of war in Syria had completely ruined the country, and placed the colony in the most disastrous circumstances. Nehemiah was informed of the unhappy state of his countrymen by one of his "brethren" named Hanani, who had reached Shushan in a caravan from Judea, and who with sundry other Jews appear to have had an interview with him on the subject. They intimated to him that few of the regulations introduced by Ezra remained in force, and that amid the confusions of war the condition of the Jews was continually becoming more wretched. This intelligence so much affected Nehemiah that the king observed his melan-

choly, and inquired the cause on an occasion when Esther was present. The zealous Hebrew told him of the desolation of his country, and that he could not be otherwise than sad while the city, the "place of the sepulchre of his fathers, lay waste, and the gates thereof were consumed with fire." The king was himself affected at the representation of the state of Jerusalem, and appointed Nehemiah to the office of governor of Judea, with full power to fortify the holy city, and to secure it from those disasters to which unprotected places are always exposed in time of war. Orders were sent to the royal officers west of the Euphrates, to render efficient assistance in the restoration and fortification of Jerusalem, and, says Nehemiah, "a letter unto Asaph, the keeper of the king's forest, that he may give me timber to make beams for the gates of the palace that appertained to the house, and for the wall of the city, and for the house that I shall enter into." The *king's forest* here mentioned is supposed to have been at Mount Libanus, near the sources of the river Kadisha, as that place was celebrated for its cedars; the *house* was the Temple; and the other house noticed was intended to be a residence for Nehemiah and the future governors of Judea. "It is manifest," says Professor Jahn, "from the whole narrative, that Nehemiah, who presented wine to his royal master in the presence of the queen, and consequently in the harem, was in high favour with the king, and it is equally evident that he was a person of rank and authority at the court; for he travelled with a great retinue, maintained a large body of servants, and kept open table at Jerusalem, without receiving the usual compensation from the Jews as governor of the province. That a royal cup-bearer should be invested with such dignity will not surprise any one who has read the *Cyropædia*."

Thus commissioned by Artaxerxes, Nehemiah set out on his journey to Judea accompanied by "captains of the army and horsemen." As soon as he arrived

he presented his royal commission to the king's officers, and was acknowledged governor of Judea. He made his proposition for fortifying Jerusalem to the elders who composed the Jewish council, and the high priest Eliashib, and all the heads of houses, engaged zealously in the work. A serious opposition, however, was offered by Sanballat the "Haronite," Tobiah the "Ammonite," and Geshem the "Arabian," who endeavoured to thwart the undertaking by threats of a hostile attack, by insults, plots, and malicious insinuations that it was a preparation for revolt; but the Jews proceeded earnestly in the work, notwithstanding this formidable opposition, armed their labourers, protected them by a guard of citizens also armed, and at length completed the walls of the city. During the progress of the work Nehemiah improved the condition of the people by the abolition of illegal usury, and when the whole was completed he provided the new fortifications with suitable defenders, by inducing his countrymen to settle at Jerusalem. The regular services of the Temple were re-established, and, in imitation of Ezra, he expelled the idolatrous females who were married to Jews. At the close of the twelfth year of his office, in the year B. C. 445, or 432, he returned to the king, leaving the government to the care of his brother, Hanani, with whom he associated Hananiah, the ruler of the palace, "for," he says, "he was a faithful man, and feared God above many." He afterwards came a second time to Jerusalem. Nehemiah was probably the last governor delegated by the Persian kings, who after his death appear to have left the government of Judea to the high priests, in which state it was when the Persian Empire was overthrown by Alexander the Great.

The Book of Nehemiah abounds with some very important statistical facts and historical details, which, on account of the limits of this volume, cannot be investigated in such a manner as to do justice to the subject, and we can only lay before the reader the judicious summary

of a learned writer :—"The Book," says Dr Gray, "begins with an account of Nehemiah's grief at the report of the desolation of Jerusalem, and of his application to Artaxerxes for permission to visit and rebuild the 'place of his fathers' sepulchre. Nehemiah then relates his departure and arrival at Jerusalem with authority, and feelingly describes the state of the city, and his exertions to repair its dismantled walls. He records the names of those patriotic men who assisted him on this occasion, the conspiracy of the Ammonites and other enemies against the work, and the defeat of their designs. After finishing the walls and fortifications, Nehemiah applied himself to other public objects. The scarcity of inhabitants in the large city of Jerusalem first excited his attention. He fortunately at this time found a register of those persons who returned from the Captivity under Zerubbabel, which he repeats in the seventh chapter, in order to complete the restoration of their possessions to the respective tribes, and to provide that none but the Levites and descendants of Aaron might officiate in the service of the Temple and the priesthood. Nehemiah then describes the public reading of the Law to the people, the celebration of the feast of tabernacles, and other religious appointments observed, with a pathetic commemoration and thanksgiving for former mercies, as described in preceding Books of Scripture. Then follows an account of the renewal of the covenant of obedience and respect to God's law, recorded as a memorial, with the names of those who signed it; and also a catalogue of those who were appointed by lot, or consented, to live at Jerusalem, which was surrounded by hostile neighbours; and the Book concludes with a description of the reformation both civil and religious which Nehemiah effected." "It hath been commonly said," observes Dr Jortin, "that motives are better taught and better enforced by example than by precept. If so, we have in the person of Nehemiah an instance of public spirit, or the love of country, which may

be set against any thing that history can produce, and which will suffer by no comparison; nor can Greece or Rome boast of a hero superior to him in this great and good quality." This excellent author says in another place—"If Nehemiah had lived in some polite age and country, he would have had statues erected in public places, and all the regard paid to him which a generous and ingenuous people can bestow upon true merit. But as he performed his good works principally for the service of God and of religion, he desired to have his reward rather from God than from men, and therefore he breaks out once and again in these words—"Think upon me, my God, for good, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy." He prays that God would accept his good intentions, and forgive his imperfections. He had his recompence in both worlds—happy in the love of his people, and happy in seeing his honest labours blest with success; and his own history, written by himself, and being part of the Holy Scriptures, transmits his name and his reputation to all generations, while statues, and pillars, and other frail monuments of human grandeur, moulder away, and fall into oblivion."

Dr Prideaux dates the second administration of Nehemiah from the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, in the year B. C. 408. It was then that he undertook the second reformation, in consequence of which Manasseh, the son of the high priest Joiada, not Jaddu, as in Josephus, fled to Samaria, because he was unwilling to part with his wife, who was a daughter of the Samaritan chief Sanballat. "The interval," says Jahn, "from the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, the date of Nehemiah's return to Persia, to the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, from B. C. 432 to 408, includes only twenty-four years, and is therefore not too great. When he came to Jerusalem the first time he was royal cup-bearer, an office most usually filled by handsome young men. He was then probably between twenty and thirty years old, and, consequently, after a residence

of twelve years in Judea, and of twenty-four more in Persia, he would have reached the age of fifty-six or sixty-six, a time of life at which he might easily be supposed to leave the service of the court and become governor of his own people. If, as Josephus says, Nehemiah lived to a very great age, he would now have many years to spend in Jerusalem. If his life had extended to a hundred years, he might himself have written the twenty-second verse of the twelfth chapter of the Book which bears his name, 'The Levites in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, and Johanan, and Jaddua,'—for though Jaddua, who was an old man in the time of Alexander the Great, B. C. 331, could not have been high priest under Darius Nothus, yet in the last years of that monarch he might have been fifteen or twenty years old, and so have his name placed in the register as heir to the priesthood. I will not, however, insist on this, for both the passage and the genealogy of the high priests in the tenth and eleventh verses appear to have been completed by a later hand.—It is expressly stated (Neh. xiii. 28), that this last reformation took place under Joiada the high priest, for in the words, *one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the high priest*, the title *high priest* belongs not to the word *Eliashib*, but to Joiada. Every tyro in the Oriental languages knows that the words—*the son of*—with the preceding and succeeding names, compose but one proper noun, and that the following name of office belongs to the son and not to the father. But that Eliashib was dead before the second arrival of Nehemiah at Jerusalem seems evident from the manner in which he is spoken of, Neh. xiii. 4, 5, 7. From the tone of the narrative we should naturally be led to infer that the subjects of it were no longer living. The Alexandrian Chronicle places the death of Eliashib and the first year of his successor Joiada in the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, B. C. 412; and, consequently, according to this Chronicle the second return of Nehemiah must have taken place after this year. The Book

of Malachi has reference to the circumstances of those times. Tradition places this prophet in the last administration of Nehemiah, and the detention of the tithes, defective offerings, and heathen marriages, first became general about this period. The severe censures which Malachi passes on the marriage of priests with foreign women are perhaps aimed directly at Manasseh, the son of Joiada. The deplorable condition of which the Jews complained, as related in the Book of Nehemiah, was occasioned principally by the Persian expeditions to Egypt, whose route lay through Judea, and consequently subjected that country to a share in the evils of war. Amid the confusion of war the institutions of the Hebrews might easily be shaken and corrupted by abuses, and the circumstances of the nation depressed."

NICANOR, one of the seven deacons ordained by the Apostles.

NICOLAS, one of the seven deacons, who is described as a "proselyte of Antioch." This seems to intimate not merely a *proselyte of the gate*, with whom the Jews held no communication, Acts x. 2, 28, but one who had been circumcised, and observed the whole Law of Moses.

NICODEMUS, a "ruler of the Jews," in other words, a member of the great council called the Sanhedrim, who secretly believed in the divine authority of our blessed Saviour, and who held with him by night the interesting conversation recorded by St John. He is again noticed by the Evangelist as incurring censure of the Pharisees for reminding them of a wise enactment in their own Law; and he assisted at the burial of Christ, and brought "a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight."

NOAH, a celebrated Patriarch and Prophet, and who may be said to be the second father of mankind, was descended from Seth, the third son of Adam whose name is given, and was born, according to the Hebrew chronology, in the year B.C. 2948. A general corruption of manners prevailed in his time among the

human race, but he was preserved uncontaminated by the evil examples which surrounded him, and he secured to himself the Divine approbation by his piety and exemplary virtues. He became a "preacher of righteousness," and endeavoured to restore true religion; but his efforts were unavailing, and the whole race of mankind, with the exception of himself and his own family, were consigned to destruction by a universal deluge. This tremendous event is recorded by Moses, is referred to by various uninspired writers of antiquity, and is recollected in numerous ancient traditions,

which have been preserved in almost every country. When the waters subsided and Noah left the Ark, he dwelt in the plain of Ararat in Armenia, and died in the year B.C. 1998, in the nine hundred and fiftieth year of his age. All the authentic particulars of Noah and his family are recorded in the Book of Genesis, but he is the hero of innumerable legends, in which, though under different names, his identity cannot be mistaken. He is mentioned by several of the inspired writers in the most eulogistic manner as one of the great worthies of Patriarchal antiquity.

O

OBADIAH, one of the Minor Prophets, of whom nothing authentic is known, nor can it be ascertained when he flourished. The Jews believe that he is the same Obadiah, the governor of Ahab's palace, who concealed and fed the hundred prophets whom Jezebel would have put to death; and Jerome adopts this supposition. Others allege that he was that Obadiah whom Josiah made overseer of the works of the Temple. Some writers make him contemporary with Hosea, Amos, and Joel; others with Jeremiah after the taking of Jerusalem. Du Pin inclines to the opinion that he lived in the time of Ahaz, when the Edomites, in conjunction with the Ten Tribes, waged war against the kingdom of Judah—a supposition which is strengthened by the fact that his prophecy is wholly directed against the Edomites. Obadiah's Prophecy is short, but composed with much beauty, and conveys an instructive lesson against human confidence and malicious exaltation.

OMRI, a king of the Ten Tribes, who reigned twelve years, and is chiefly remarkable for being the founder of Samaria, about thirty-two miles north of

Jerusalem, which he made his capital, where all the succeeding kings of Israel resided. He was the father of Ahab.

ONESIMUS, a slave of Philemon, who had fled from his master, after robbing him, and had taken up his residence at Rome, where he was converted to Christianity by St Paul. The Apostle reclaimed him to a sense of his duty, and sent him back to Philemon with the Epistle addressed to him, requesting him to receive his slave now converted into his family. Philemon not only received Onesimus as a faithful servant, but as a friend, and sent him back to St Paul, that he might be useful to him at Rome. From this time the employment of Onesimus was to act as one of the Apostle's coadjutors. It is traditionally stated that he was stoned at Rome for his faith. In the Greek Church he is commemorated on the fifteenth of December. See **PHILEMON**.

OTHNIEL, or **OTHONIEL**, a relative of the celebrated Caleb, overcame the Mesopotamians, and rescued the Israelites from their tyranny, by whom he was acknowledged their judge or regent. During his administration, which continued forty years, the people remained

faithful to God, and were consequently in a prosperous condition. He married Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, who was

bestowed upon him by her father as a reward for taking the town of Kirjath-sepher.

PAUL, originally called SAUL, a native of Tarsus, the metropolis of Cilicia, and a citizen of the Roman empire. He was, however, a Jew by birth, both his father and mother being Hebrews of the tribe of Benjamin. It would seem that they had long left the land of their fathers, and resided in that very populous and wealthy city, apparently pursuing some lucrative profession, supposed to have been that of commissary to the Roman armies. Paul seems to have been an only son, though he had at least one sister. We learn from Strabo, that the inhabitants of Tarsus were distinguished above those of both Athens and Alexandria in their ardent study of philosophy, and of the whole circle of science. The Asiatic mind was distinguished even among the Greeks for the florid character of its imagery, and the impetuous power of its eloquence. In these celebrated schools of heathen learning and science the young Hebrew spent his earlier years, and we have every reason to believe that he distinguished himself among his fellow students for the enthusiasm with which he drank at that fountain of learning, rapidly making himself master of all the treasures of heathen philosophy, and elevating his imagination by the study of the noble poetry of the Greeks. From the ardent energy of his mind, the clearness of his natural judgment, and that lofty ambition of intellect which, even when he knew truths of a higher and purer character, urged him onward with tameless activity and glowing delight in the unlimited career of excellence and perfection, which he saw stretched out in endless glory before him, he showed himself capable of rising to the highest fame among a people, where

eloquence and learning were held in the greatest esteem, and were most liberally rewarded. His own ambitious mind probably took this direction, and in the state of the world at the time, he had every human chance before him of ample success. But though he studied the poetry and eloquence and philosophy of Greece with enthusiasm and success, he did it as a Jew, who knew that in the treasured wisdom of the beloved land of his fathers, he could drink at perennial fountains of purer truth than the fabulous springs of Castalia, and ascend to loftier heights and a clearer atmosphere than the imaginary inspired regions of the heathen Parnassus. We know not what time he spent in the academic shades of the heathen schools of Tarsus, but from his frequent reference in after days to the dogmas of the Greek philosophy, and his quotations from three of their poets, Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides, didactic, dramatic, and lyric, we have reason to conclude that he had learned all that was to be gained in those celebrated schools. We do not know from the sacred Scriptures what was the profession or occupation of his father, but like every Jew, according to the maxim of his country, that "he who taught not his son some trade, taught him to be a thief," he brought up his son Saul to be a tent-maker. This was the custom of even the Rabbis of Judea, who, besides their designation of doctors of the law, were called by some trade, as Rabbi Judah the baker, Rabbi Johanan the shoemaker. In those countries, and in those days of incessant warfare, the trade of Paul was necessary as well as gainful, and we shall see that from necessity and choice he afterwards turned it to useful account.

After he had acquired all the learning to be obtained at Tarsus, he was sent to Jerusalem to study there the laws and religion of his own country, despised indeed by the heathen philosophers, but from which they borrowed largely without acknowledgment. Here he studied under Gamaliel, the son of Simeon, supposed to be that aged saint who welcomed Jesus on his presentation in the Temple. Gamaliel was president of the Sanhedrim, and highly honoured by the Jews for his great learning. It is likely that Paul was prosecuting his studies at the feet of this great teacher, at the very time when another and greater had come to the Israelites, to fulfil and make all prophecy and all doctrine clear, and to purify the law from the false comments of the proud and corrupt rabbis who now sat in the chair of Moses. If, however, he heard and saw the Teacher of all truth, it was with prejudiced mind, and self-satisfied pride in his own wisdom. The lowly Jesus of Nazareth, with illiterate Galilean fishermen as his disciples, was far from answering the glorious ideas of a temporal sovereign and victorious deliverer, which the ambitious Paul, the favourite pupil of the president of the great council, had formed of what the Messiah should be. From his after conduct we may perhaps conclude that he was one of the most zealous of those who objected to the doctrines which he was destined so ardently to embrace and to propagate—the most fiery of those who shouted “crucify, crucify,” and urged on the persecution of the innocent.

Whether this was the case or not, he was exceedingly zealous for the traditions of the elders, being educated according to the strictest notions of the Pharisees. That bigoted and proud sect courted popularity, and gained it by an outward appearance of great sanctity and fiery zeal for the law of Moses, as they called it, but, in reality, for precepts and observances of their own, which they imposed upon the people under the specious name of “traditions of the fathers.” It is reported that Gamaliel was secretly,

like Nicodemus, a believer in the divine authority of Jesus, for which there is no other authority than his judicious speech to the council in reference to the persecution of the apostles. If he had any serious thoughts of the possibility of their being in the right, and of all their opposers fighting against God, it is evident that he taught no such sentiments to Paul. He was taught to be fierce in bigotry as the fiercest, to hate and persecute to death every one who would not join their party, and implicitly acknowledge the superior perfection of their system. Of the supreme excellency of their doctrines he was completely, and, to appearance, sincerely convinced, and had studied them with all the ardour of a mind which panted after distinction, and was ambitious of advancement. That zeal carried him forward in his studies with rapid success, and he long afterwards informs us that he profited in the Jews’ religion above most of his associates. The open and severe condemnation which Christ had passed upon their pretended zeal, but gross hypocrisy and corruptions, and the equally bold defiance of his apostles and disciples, rendered all the followers of the new religion objects of their peculiar hatred.

This bigoted spirit of persecution first proceeded to acts of bloody cruelty against the disciples in the case of Stephen. Paul seems to have been present at the semblance of a hearing which was given him by the Sanhedrim. His recorded defence fully justified him in all that he and the apostles urged upon the belief and reception of the people, and as completely proved the guilt and danger of the rulers in rejecting Christ. But instead of being called by it to reflection and caution, they only gnashed upon him with their teeth, cast him out of the city, and stoned him to death. Paul gave his full concurrence to this deed of savage cruelty and gross injustice. He stood by with delight, keeping the upper garments of the more active instruments of sacerdotal rage.

Pontius Pilate, the responsible procu-

rator, who had kept the furious bigotry of the Jews in check, had been recalled to answer to the jealous emperor for his conduct, and the priests and rulers of the Jews had full scope for the display of the spirit of fanaticism with which they were animated. They were bent on exterminating the disciples of Jesus with the same judicial infatuation and blindness to the power of God which they had shown in rejecting and crucifying their Saviour. Paul had now "tasted blood," and, as Tertullian remarks, he soon verified to the full the prophetic character which Jacob had given of the head of his tribe, "Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf; in the morning he shall devour the prey, and in the evening he shall divide the spoil." Paul was yet in the morning of his days, being not much above thirty years old, and he instantly set himself to the work of extermination with a headlong and zealous cruelty, which must have strongly recommended him to the dominant sect of the Pharisees. We are not informed whether Gamaliel was one of those chief priests who gave Paul such a destroying commission. Such a proceeding was in direct opposition to the advice he had some years before given the council, "to let those men alone, for, if the counsel and work were of men, it would come to nought; but if it were of God, they could not overthrow it;" therefore they should beware of fighting against God. Neither they nor Paul, however, had any such fear. In the name of God, and in pretended honour of his cause, they were determined to destroy that work which he had already sanctioned with such indubitable proofs of his authority and favour. A great persecution immediately arose against the Church in Jerusalem, and we learn from Paul that he was a ready and delighted instrument in carrying it on. He made havoc of the Church; being exceedingly mad against those who professed faith in Christ, he entered into every house in search of them, and dragged them remorselessly to prison and to trial. We know not whether the young bigot was

afraid to seize upon the apostles, of whose miraculous deliverances and supernatural powers he must have heard, or whether they prudently eluded the search of this young wolf of Benjamin, or were protected by the hand of God from the storm of blood. We are told by his own friendly biographer, Luke, who no doubt heard it from his own lips, that they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria except the apostles. But such success, as he counted it, only kindled his ambition of fame—only gave impetus to that fiery zeal which burned within him. Breathing threatening and slaughter, he asked and received a commission from the high priest to follow the same course in other countries, which he had commenced so much to the applause of his party in Jerusalem. The first city where he determined to reap such bloody laurels was Damascus, in which there was a number of Jewish synagogues. But that blind zeal was upon the point of being enlightened; that restless energy was soon to be directed to a very different and nobler object than the quenching of the light of truth, and the persecution of its followers. As he and his party, like famished wolves ready to pounce upon the helpless fold, drew near to Damascus, whose Christian inhabitants had heard with terror of his approach, suddenly a light from heaven shone around them. It was mid-day, but the uncreated light of heaven can eclipse the brightness of noon, and the conscious murderers fell on their faces. Christ revealed himself to Paul in his celestial glory, told him of the folly and danger of thus fighting against God, letting him know that in persecuting his humblest followers he was persecuting himself. The astonished persecutor was now convinced that he whom he had believed to be an impostor was indeed risen and glorified, and that he himself was misled by his own frenzied fanaticism. Christ told him that he appeared to make him a minister and witness to the truth of those very doctrines which he now persecuted, that he would de

fend him from both Jews and Gentiles, appointing him an apostle, especially to the latter. He commanded the prostrate and terrified Paul to go to Damascus, where he would be informed what he was to do. It is evident from the relation given by Luke, and the account which Paul gave of the same vision to Agrippa, that Jesus appeared to his bodily eyes, and that Paul recognised him as that Jesus whom the Jews had crucified. The rest of the company had remained prostrate, paralyzed with terror at the light, and at the sound which they heard, but did not understand. At last they arose and found Paul struck blind by the dazzling brightness which had poured upon his eyes during that celestial colloquy. But the brighter light of divine truth now dawned on his darkened mind, and he had received a commission which enabled him, when those filmy scales, which now threw a deep gloom over the face of creation, should have fallen off, to open the eyes of the spiritually blind, and to turn them from darkness unto light.

Paul's companions led him to Damascus, where he continued three days blind, spending all the time without either eating or drinking. This was a natural expression of his bitter remorse for the wickedness of his past conduct, and of deep contrition for his aggravated guilt. This expressed itself in prayer to that God and Saviour whom he had so deeply offended, and who had so wonderfully interfered to arrest him in his career of perdition. We learn also from the Divine message to Ananias, a convert of Damascus, that Paul saw visions, and received supernatural communications during that long fast. Ananias obeyed the command given him—laid his hands upon the penitent—restored him to sight, comforted, instructed, and baptized him, in proof of his repentance, and faith, and forgiveness. Thus the very instrument which seemed destined to extirpate and destroy the truth of the Gospel, was in a moment converted into one of its strongest sup-

porters. Nothing but the immediate hand and power of God could have done it. For here was an ambitious young man, enthusiastic in attachment to the traditions of his fathers, which he believed to be the certain truth of God, as bitterly opposed to the doctrines of Jesus of Nazareth, which he believed to be subversive of the religion of Moses—high in favour of the all-powerful and popular priesthood, and apparently entering on a course of active duty in their cause, which could not fail to lead him to honour and power, who, all at once, becomes a member of that poor sect which he hated and despised, and hunted to destruction like wild beasts. Such a conversion was calculated to throw the priests and rulers into amazement, and ought to have called upon them to ponder on their proceedings. Saul was not one of the unlearned and ignorant, as they considered the humble fishermen of Galilee. According to their ideas his mind was expanded and elevated by the study of all the literature and science of Greece, enlightened by the learned instructions of their most admired Rabbis, and firmly established in those strict doctrines which they thought raised them above, and separated them from all the rest of mankind. Such a convert, in such circumstances, could not have been made but upon the most demonstrative evidence; and his being added to the church, in which he so fiercely spread havoc and desolation at this time, was an intimation and proof to the disciples that their Master, according to his promise, was still with them, that he was determined to protect them, and make the truth which they preached triumphant.

Had Paul become a disciple in any ordinary way—had the truth come upon his mind slowly, as it did upon the minds of the personal followers of Jesus, it would have been becoming in him to have gone to Jerusalem, and been instructed more fully and accurately in the doctrines which he was henceforth to preach to the world. But he had no need of this. He

had now as thorough a conviction as ever man could give him that Jesus was the Christ: he had already studied with more than ordinary diligence all the ancient laws and prophecies which prepared his way, and pointed out his character. He now received, by immediate revelation from Christ himself, the full knowledge of the bearing of the one system upon the other—of the perfect fulfilment of every part of the former in the latter. He also received, by immediate revelation, a knowledge of all the facts and doctrines of the Gospel which it was necessary for him to understand and declare. He therefore conferred not, as he had no occasion to confer, with flesh and blood, but immediately, without asking of the apostles any confirmation of that office which had been conferred on him by Christ himself, he preached the divinity of Christ in the synagogues of Damascus. Such a strange occurrence naturally excited amazement among the Jews—they could not believe it possible that such a bigoted persecutor of the disciples should all at once become one of their boldest and most zealous advocates. Experience soon added to his natural courage and confidence in the goodness of his cause: he confounded the unbelieving Jews, who attempted to argue against him, proving that Jesus was certainly their promised Messiah.

At this time Paul did not stop long at Damascus. He tells us in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he went into Arabia, where he must have stayed at least two years. As it is nowhere stated that there were many converts in that country, or that he laboured in preaching the Gospel during that retirement, it has been concluded that he spent those years in studying the Scriptures of the Old Dispensation more deeply, and with the spiritual light, which gave him a new and better understanding of their contents. As, besides, he was not an "Apostle of men," but directly ordained and commissioned like the rest by Jesus Christ, it was necessary, like them, that he should receive immediate instruction from him. Here,

we are entitled to conclude, he received direct information by vision and revelation. He speaks frequently of this personal communication, and receiving from Christ himself doctrines and rules, facts and precepts mentioned in his own speeches, or letters, and which do not occur in the writings of any of the other Apostles and Evangelists.

At last he returned to Damascus, and preached with undaunted courage, proving, with resistless force of reasoning, the great doctrine of the Scriptures, that Jesus died for the sins of men, and was risen for their salvation. The bigoted unbelieving Jews had only one way of meeting such evidence and answering such arguments. It was the very same which Paul employed when he was of similar sentiments with them, with which alone error can pretend to encounter truth—they determined to silence his eloquence by death. He had reason to expect such treatment, and being made aware of their designs defeated them. They watched the gates day and night to make sure of their intended victim; but the disciples lowered their zealous preacher over the wall in a basket. He therefore went to Jerusalem, for the first time since his conversion, to join himself to the apostolic college, of which he was now a divinely constituted member. They were, however, afraid of one whose former conduct had rendered him an object of such merited condemnation, and not having heard of his miraculous conversion, refused to receive him. Barnabas, who was an early acquaintance, and who had heard of his change of life, introduced him to Peter and James, who were the only apostles whom at that time he saw, as he informs the Galatians. When they knew that he was really become a disciple of Him whom he had formerly persecuted, they willingly received him, and he stayed fifteen days with Peter. We might have supposed that the appearance of such an individual as a convert to the gospel, would have excited anxious interest and curiosity, and that all classes of his former acquaint-

ance would have been eager to hear what reasons he could advance for such a wonderful change of sentiment. He had these reasonable expectations himself, for he openly and boldly preached the doctrines of Jesus, arguing against those very persons with whom he had formerly acted. They were not more candid or patient of reasoning than those of Damascus, and would have ended the dispute in the same way, by putting him to death. He was determined, however, to persevere in publicly vindicating that doctrine to which he had devoted his life, as we learn from himself while pleading his own cause on a future occasion before the Jews. While he was in the temple praying for assistance and direction, he fell into an ecstatic trance, and Christ again appeared to him, commanding him to depart from that city, for they would not listen to him, however clear and convincing his arguments were. The zealous and sanguine apostle is represented as arguing the matter with Christ, as if it were impossible that any obstinacy of unbelief could stand before the arguments which he could produce. So confident was he in the convincing strength of that truth which he taught, and yet so ignorant of the opposing strength of bigotry in the carnal mind, which is enmity against God! Christ at last commanded him to depart to his mission to preach the gospel among the Gentiles. He therefore was unknown at this time to the churches of Judea, for the apostles sent him away by Syria to Tarsus.

By comparing different notes of time given in his various Epistles, we are led to conclude that Paul continued three years at least in the country of Asia Minor. It is not likely that one of his energetic habits and ardent temperament would be idle or silent in regard to the great doctrines of salvation in which he now gloried. We cannot trace his progress during these years, but we have reason to believe that he founded many churches there. It was during this period also that he had those visions and

revelations of which he speaks to the Corinthians, when he was caught up to the third heaven, the celestial paradise, where he heard and saw things which it was not possible for the language of man to utter or describe. Lest, as he says, he should be exalted above measure, by these high favours, there was given him "a thorn in the flesh—a messenger of Satan to buffet him." In his Epistle to the Galatians he speaks of this infirmity of the flesh which, as he thought, disabled him from preaching efficiently. It is supposed to have been some acute disease, or paralytic affection, and humbled under the feeling of its rendering him contemptible as a minister of the Gospel, he thrice prayed to be healed, but received the assurance of Christ that his grace was sufficient.

Paul no doubt spent part of this time at Tarsus, but we are not informed what success he met with in preaching to the former friends and teachers of his youth more ennobling and consoling truths than they had ever delivered to him. He had not yet indeed preached out of the synagogues of the Jews, as far as we have any ground of knowing, or at least beyond the Gentile proselytes. But there must have been Jewish synagogues in that seat of learning and extensive commerce. While he was here, Barnabas, who had been sent from Jerusalem to instruct and confirm the numerous converts that had been made in Antioch, finding the field too large and burdensome for his labours, came to Tarsus to ask the assistance of Paul. He readily accompanied his early friend. They continued here for a year, and their labours were crowned with extraordinary success. In this city the disciples of all countries, to do away with distinctions which kept up the remembrance of ancient hostility, or national prejudices, were first called by the general name of Christians. If the name was indeed assumed by themselves, or given by the Apostles, this must have been the reason, but it has been thought that since the word has a Latin and not a Greek termination, it was given them,

as a new sect, by the Roman authorities. The word does not occur above thrice in the New Testament, and learned men have thought that the writers designedly avoided using it, either as a term of reproach, or lest it should be supposed that they were aiming at some temporal authority under the designation.

At this time a severe famine, which destroyed many, visited the land of Judea, and having been predicted at Antioch by Agabus, the Christians there contributed liberally for the support of their poor brethren at Jerusalem, and sent their charitable gift by Barnabas and Paul. They do not seem to have remained any long time there, for a year afterwards we find them again with a numerous body of believers out of all nations at Antioch. It was revealed to the general body of inspired teachers that they should set apart Paul and Barnabas to preach the gospel in other places, which was accordingly done. They sailed first to the populous island of Cyprus, of which the latter was a native. This island was under the Roman government, and the president with proconsular power was Sergius Paulus, who was converted by Paul in the following manner. There was a pretended Jewish magician who had imposed upon him by false miracles. He opposed the Christian preachers, and endeavoured to prejudice the Roman deputy against them. Paul rebuked the impious impostor sternly, and denounced the vengeance of heaven upon him, that he who blinded others with his wicked sorceries should himself be struck blind till he repented. "A mist and darkness" fell upon those eyes which were blind to the light of truth, and open only to look after his selfish gain, and this proof of divine power persuaded the proconsul to listen with favour to the new doctrine, and he believed and was converted. After this Luke always calls the Apostle by his Roman name Paul, whence it has been by some concluded that it was assumed by him in compliment to his illustrious convert. It is as likely that he assumed it when he went first

among the Gentiles, and was led to take this name as being personally characteristic, the word signifying *little*, which by all accounts Paul was to an uncommon degree. Chrysostom styles him *ἀνθρωπος τριπηνχους*, a man of three cubits. This, if taken as literally accurate, would indicate that the Apostle of the Gentiles was no more than four feet and a half high. But we know that the word is used in a general proverbial sense for one of very small stature, just as *ἀνθρωπος τριεκαταπηχους*, a man of thirteen cubits, is used to designate one of unnaturally large stature, though not exactly nineteen feet and a half high.

Having met with this flattering success, they prosecuted the object of their mission by sailing for Asia Minor. They landed in Pamphylia, and at Perga, a city near the coast, John Mark left them, in all likelihood deterred by the appearance of danger before them. Paul and Barnabas travelled onward to Antioch, the capital of Pisidia. Here there was a synagogue of the Jews, and into it Paul according to custom entered. At the request of the rulers of this place of worship, Paul at great length explained to them the purport of their mission, and the substance of his doctrine. He proved to them out of their own Scriptures that the whole of the dispensation of religion given to their fathers was temporary, and preparatory for a more perfect and spiritual form of the truth—that this was foretold as to be introduced by a Deliverer, who was most minutely pointed out in all their prophecies—that this Saviour had already come, and the Jews had rejected and crucified him, as had been foretold, but that he had risen again from the dead, and was now established as the only author of salvation, inviting them to believe, and cautioning them strongly against impenitence and infidelity. We have seen hitherto that Paul's course at first was to confine his message and exhortations to those of his own country, and to the proselytes who worshipped in their synagogues. This practice, we will find, he all along observed

till they positively and fiercely rejected the counsel of God which he set before them. It is particularly interesting to learn what were the topics which he touched upon before such an audience, and the kind of arguments made use of by him. These were naturally nearly in the same strain to similar congregations, and here Luke has given us the substance of that convincing argument.

The reasonings of the Apostle were listened to with attention, and produced their good effects. Many followed them, and became converts to the belief of the doctrines which he taught, and the Gentile proselytes of Judaism requested that the same truths should be preached to them again. The novelty of the doctrines and public curiosity brought an immense multitude of all classes to hear this new preacher, and many who came from such motives probably remained to believe and to pray. Wonderful success attended the preaching of truths altogether new to the ears of those who heard them. This excited in no ordinary degree the resentment of the bigoted Jews—they attempted to argue against Paul, but, as usual, their arguments were only railing and rage. They, however, had influence enough with those in power to create a prejudice against these teachers; a persecution was raised against them, and in compliance with the command of Christ, and in imitation of his example, and also in pursuance of the work upon which they had come forth, they shook off the dust of their feet in testimony of their offer being rejected, and proceeded to Iconium. Here they abode a long time, and were eminently successful. The preaching of the truth was confirmed by signs and wonders. But truths accompanied with such power, and which brought such consolation to the Gentiles, and inspired them with joy, had the contrary effect with the prejudiced Jews. Instead, however, of attempting to answer their arguments, or prove that the miracles were the tricks of imposters, they determined to stone them. Again, therefore, they fled to sow the seed of the truth in other dis-

tricts. They directed their course to the south, and at Lystra their miraculous powers brought them into a danger of a different kind. Paul, by a word, had cured a man who had been lame from birth. The people concluded that those who possessed powers so far above human must be gods, and proceeded to offer sacrifice to them as to the greatest of their divinities. They rent their clothes, persuaded the people to believe that they resembled themselves in every attribute of humanity, and had been commissioned by the supreme Ruler of the universe to open their eyes to the folly of such absurd idolatry. We are left to conclude what salutary effect this reasoning had upon the minds of these gross idolaters. It could not have been very deep or lasting on the mass, for the great enemies of Christ, the Jews, came thither to oppose the Apostle, and persuaded the multitude to stone him, who might have been worshipped as a god by them, if he had chosen to encourage the impious idolatry. He was dragged out of the city as dead, but while his mourning friends and converts stood around with the intention of performing the last rites of kindness, he arose and came again into the city. Instead of being deterred by such opposition and persecution, the Apostle was rendered more confident and bold. He knew the fight of glory and of truth which was before him, but he knew Him in whom he believed, and had seen in beatific vision the unspeakable glory of those palaces of celestial bliss, which no eye has seen, and no imagination can conceive. Instead of fleeing farther from the face of danger, like a devoted and gallant soldier he faced it—he and Barnabas revisited all the towns and cities in which they had planted the seeds of truth, watered them anew, bestowed upon their converts spiritual gifts, ordained elders in all the churches, that the truth might be established, and prevail more and more, exhorting them not to be discouraged by such opposition and persecution as they had encountered, for that they must encounter much tribulation

before they could enter the kingdom of heaven. Having thus made a circuit of many hundred miles in Asia, they returned to the church at Antioch of Syria, and there gave an account of their labours and success.

In this city Paul remained some years labouring successfully in that wide field. Hitherto the Gentile converts had not been required in any shape to undergo the initiatory rites of the Mosaic economy, or to practise the observances which were now no longer necessary, or possessed of any meaning, since they had been all fulfilled in the sacrifice of Christ, and the faith of the worshipper transferred from the symbolic type to the anti-type. During these years, however, some Jewish converts came down from Jerusalem to Antioch, who propounded the doctrine among the Gentile Christians, that unless they were circumcised, and observed the whole Law of Moses, they could not be saved. This was a gross misconception of the nature of the gospel—a tyrannical usurpation upon the liberty which it conferred—a bringing back to the narrow and severe bondage by which all were held under subjection to the sacerdotal power—necessary, indeed, and supremely useful at the time, but now altogether uncalled for, and only a stumbling-block of prejudice and offence to the Gentiles. Our Apostle resisted such unnecessary and burdensome impositions, and disputed both the principles and authority of such narrow-minded and Judaizing teachers. Whoever these men were, and whatever was their faith, it is evident they had assumed such authority of themselves. But they persisted with equal keenness in maintaining their doctrines as the Apostle did in opposing them. There was only one mode of settling this question, which was evidently one of fundamental consequence, and that was by an appeal to the collected body of Apostles at Jerusalem. We learn also from Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, in which he treats this question very fully, that this method of settling the dispute was made

known to him by particular revelation. In a matter of such vital importance, it was absolutely necessary that there should be first a full understanding of the bearing of the doctrine either way, and of as great consequence that there should be a perfect concord and harmony of sentiment and belief. The foundations of schism in the Church were already laid, and unless they were removed upon understood and settled principles, they might grow up into opposing sects which bore as deadly hatred to each other as those of the Pharisees and Sadducees, or of the Jews and Samaritans. Paul, therefore, took with him Barnabas, who was witness to the successful preaching of the gospel among the Gentiles, and was well known and highly esteemed at Jerusalem, and Titus, who, as a Gentile convert, had a deep interest in the settlement of this question.

In the same epistle Paul informs us with what prudential caution he went forward in this affair. He first set before the leading apostles privately the nature of that gospel which he preached to the Gentiles. They then called a general meeting of the believers, before whom they gave a full detail of their labours beyond Judea among the heathen, and of the bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit upon them also, and then told them of the opposition of the Pharisaic believers, and the demand they had made of the Gentiles to be subject to the Mosaic Law. The apostles and elders then met separately and discussed the merits of the question at large. It was altogether a new subject of much practical importance, in the settlement of which the most deeply-rooted prejudices of both Jews and Gentiles were involved; and while they exercised their judgment calmly, it behoved them to look for direction to that Spirit who was promised to guide them into all truth. Luke gives us the outline of the reasoning used by the chief speakers. Peter rose first, and called to the recollection of the rest the circumstances attendant on the conversion of Cornelius, which he took to be a

plain intimation of the will of God that the Gentiles would be saved by faith in Christ, without the imposition of the Law of Moses. Paul and Barnabas followed, declaring what miracles God had wrought by their means among the Gentiles. James, who seems to have presided, followed in the same strain, and the council came to the unanimous decision that the Gentiles were not in any shape to be brought under the ceremonial Law of Moses—only they enjoined the refraining from eating idol sacrifices, things strangled, blood, and from fornication. All these practices were forbidden by express statute in the Law of Moses, and all of them were looked upon very lightly by the Gentiles. With the exception of the last, however, those who read several of Paul's epistles will find that they were intended to be only of temporary obligation—probably while the Jewish Temple stood, and its present economy was still in existence. This first decree of the apostolic synod was addressed to the Gentile churches in Syria and Asia, and Jude and Silas were sent along with the deputation who had brought the question, to express more fully the mind of the apostles in such a way.

The settlement of this dispute gave complete satisfaction to the Gentiles, and when Jude returned to Jerusalem, Silas devoted himself to the labour of the gospel in Antioch. It was of importance, however, that the apostolic decree in regard to the obligation of the Mosaic Law upon the converts to Christianity should be made known among the Gentile churches. Paul well knew the intemperate zeal and intolerant bigotry of the Jews, and how much of that spirit still remained among many who believed in the gospel—even where it might have been little expected that Judaizing spirit had shown itself. Peter had lately come down from Jerusalem to visit the Christians at Antioch. At first he freely associated with the Gentile converts, in all respects treating them as brethren. But when other individuals of more Jewish prejudices came down from James,

the "bold Galilean" withdrew from that friendly intercourse, as if it had been sinful and polluting. We must conclude that these were converts from Gentile idolatry, and not simply from Jewish proselytism, for we cannot suppose that Peter would act so directly in the face of the decree which he had so lately sanctioned. This new difference of opinion gave rise to another dissension, which was so keenly carried on by the Jewish converts, that many distinguished members of the Church along with Peter dissembled, and temporized with what they knew to be the unfounded prejudices of the Jews in this matter. Paul saw the dangerous consequence of this, and fearless and upright in the cause of Christian liberty, publicly rebuked Peter for such unseemly dissimulation. We have reason to believe that Peter was made sensible of the error which he had committed through fear of giving offence to his countrymen, and walked more ingenuously afterwards. But the fear of such dangerous errors spreading and obstructing the success of the gospel, made Paul more eager to visit the Asiatic churches, for the purpose of making known the apostolic decrees, and advancing the work of conversion, which he had so well begun on former occasions. Barnabas was again to be his associate, but when he proposed to take his relative Mark as an assistant, Paul firmly objected, having formed an unfavourable opinion of one who had so unseasonably, and with such a lack of zeal and courage, deserted them at the commencement of their former mission. Barnabas had either a prejudice in favour of his cousin, or entertaining a better opinion of his zeal and devotedness than Paul, persisted in his purpose, and these warm and affectionate friends parted, nor, so far as we know, did they ever meet again. Whether this positive determination on either side, and the passion with which it was accompanied were warrantable, we will not determine, but the cause of the gospel was advanced by their separation and labour in different direc-

tions. Paul took Silas, and visited all those churches in Asia which he had before planted, delivering the conclusions of the apostolic synod in regard to the observance of the rites of Judaism, and instructing and exhorting the converts.

To show in what light he looked upon this question himself when the great principle was settled, he took Timothy, a zealous convert of Lystra, whose father was a Gentile, and his mother a Jewess, and circumcised him, that in things which he now held indifferent he might give no offence to his unconverted countrymen, or raise any obstacle in the way of a candid hearing. He extended his journey much farther than on the former mission, preaching the gospel with increasing success throughout Phrygia and Galatia. The Apostle, it would seem, had designed to travel through this extensive country in greater detail, but he was prevented twice by the Spirit of God to turn either to the right or to the left, to visit either Bithynia or Lydia. There was work prepared for them in another continent, and they were led onwards to the western shores of Asia. At Troas Paul had a divine vision by night—a Macedonian appeared, beseeching the Apostle to “come over and help them.” They had here met Luke, and when Paul related the vision of the night, they concluded that it was the will of God that they should visit Europe. It was now about twenty years since the ascension of the Saviour, and it does not appear from the sacred record that any of the apostles had ever yet sailed across the waters of the Mediterranean to preach the truth, and work miracles in support of it, in the countries where learning and the admired arts of civilization and power had for many ages flourished. It was, however, decreed by God that those nations of boasted wisdom and refinement, but now sunk into the lowest depths of vice and idolatry, should at last have the religion of heaven set before them by teachers who had received it from the lips of its infallible Author, before they were all called from the field of battle

to the reward of happiness and glory. The countries of Greece and Italy, the scenes of the noblest deeds, and sublimest exertions of the unaided reason of man, which history has delighted to record, were groaning under a race of the most brutal and licentious tyrants that ever degraded the name of sovereign, or disgraced and corrupted human nature. The supplication of that Macedonian vision of the night was indeed the cry of enslaved and suffering humanity in the ears of a God of mercy. We know that in their deep oppression they longed after deliverance, and fought for, and groped eagerly after a *truth* which to them was unknown. But the cry of that grievous oppression, and sore agony of spirit, had ascended on high from those fairest lands of the earth, reeking with blood and pollution, and their deliverer was at hand to strike off the fetters of their slavery, and to pour on their benighted minds a flood of heavenly light.

The first city in Europe at which Paul and his company stopped was Philippi, then a populous city, and one where multitudes of Romans as well as Greeks resided. As he had done in Judea, so he did here—he first preached the gospel to Jews and Jewish converts, who had a place of worship at Philippi. It was not a regular synagogue, but an open *oratory*, an uncovered enclosure by the river side. A Jewish proselyte of the name of Lydia, from Asia, was the first convert who embraced the truth, was baptized, along with her household, and constrained Paul and his followers to lodge in her house. But this appearance of success and favourable reception was soon likely to be overclouded, and those who came to proclaim “liberty to the captives,” were apparently to be deprived of it themselves for ever. As they regularly resorted to the place of public prayer, they were followed by a Pytho-ness, a female servant possessed by an evil spirit, which her masters pretended was the inspiration of their god Apollo. She continually cried out, “These men are the servants of the most high God,

who declare unto us the way of salvation!" We may conceive that this testimony, on the part of the enemy of truth, was a compulsory acknowledgment, like that of those similarly possessed among the Jews, to the divinity of Christ. Paul required no such recommendation, and the commission which he brought needed it not. He commanded the deceiving spirit to leave his victim. He soon, however, raised an opposition of a different kind against those whom he thus pretended to recommend. The masters of the damsel seeing their gainful deception ruined, raised an outcry against the new teachers, as belonging to the hated and despised nation of the Jews, who were attempting to propagate what they called the baneful superstition of that people among the Romans. They were at the time exceedingly hateful at Rome, and had been banished by Claudius from Italy, as pestilential enemies of the state. The accusation was, therefore, decidedly plausible, and when Paul and Silas were dragged as malefactors, of such a detested race, before the tribunal of the Roman magistrates of Philippi, condemnation was summary, without trial—they were beaten as the vilest criminals, and imprisoned and made fast with chains and stocks in the lowest dungeon.

Such was the reception which the truth, and its inspired and apostolic teachers, met with at the hands of the enlightened rulers of the world. Teachers less confident of their divine commission would have now been ready to conclude that the vision of the Macedonian praying for aid had been the dreaming suggestion of misguided enthusiasm. But these soldiers of the cross knew the Spirit which led them, and also that of the world against which they had to contend—they were certain of the truths which they taught, and were confident of final victory. From the depth of that dungeon, and in the pain and misery of those disgraceful stripes and apparently hopeless captivity, their fellow-prisoners heard the voice of confident prayer and joyful praise

ascend to God at midnight. Though there was none in Macedonia to help them, or deliver them out of that captivity, he who had sent them thither, and whose power reared the pillars of heaven, shook that strong dungeon to its foundation-stone. The doors burst open, and the prisoners' chains fell off. The jailor, who knew that he was responsible with his life for those under his charge, would have killed himself when he saw his dungeons thrown open, and thought his prisoners escaped. But that miraculous opening of the prison doors was emblematical of a spiritual ransom and deliverance, and liberty to him, to Philippi, to Greece, and to Europe. He saw that men under such protection were in truth the messengers of heaven; in his terror he asked them what he should do to be saved? received an answer to his question, which set the truth of God before him, and in that night he and all his household were baptized, as the first fruit of the Gentiles of Europe.

Next morning, the magistrates, understanding perhaps what had happened, and being conscious of their own illegal conduct, would have sent the Apostle and his companion off in secret. Paul, however, was a Roman citizen, and knew his privileges. From this specimen of the reception which he was probably to meet with, he determined to avail himself of these. Such punishment as that inflicted upon him and Silas, without trial and proven guilt, was high treason against the majesty of the commonwealth, and, when the civil authorities were aware of the crime of which they had been guilty, they came and humbly besought the Apostles to retire without farther proceedings. They visited their converts in the house of Lydia, and, having given them instruction and consolation, quietly left the city.

They travelled along the coast, passing through the cities of Amphipolis and Apollonia. But it would seem that there were no Jews or synagogues in either, for it does not appear that they stopped till they arrived at Thessalonica, then the capital

of the whole province of Macedonia, the residence of the proconsul and other Roman authorities, and a city of great wealth, population, and commerce. Here, "according to his custom," as Luke remarks, he went into the Jewish synagogue on the Sabbath day, and reasoned with them from their own Scriptures, upon the great subject of his ministry, demonstrating that in the life and death, and resurrection of Jesus, all the prophecies of these Scriptures were fulfilled. At first they seemed to have listened to him patiently at least, if not favourably. Perhaps they did not fully comprehend what was the real character of the Saviour whom Paul had announced, of the doctrines which were founded upon the circumstances which he detailed, and the kingdom which he was to erect. It will be observed that he so far complied with their practices as to meet them on their own Sabbaths, instead of the Christian day of worship and instruction. This he did for three weeks successively, but their preconceived notions of what their royal Saviour should be were not realized, for few of them believed or were convinced. Of the Gentile proselytes, however, who were brought to the worship of the Mosaic ritual, great multitudes were persuaded of the truths which he preached, also numbers of the chief women, of whom we learn from Josephus great numbers were made converts by the Jews wherever they settled. In his first Epistle to the church of this city, Paul also mentions that many of the worshippers of idols turned to serve the living and true God. These circumstances excited the envy and resentment of the unbelieving Jews, more than their own disappointment in not meeting with such a Messiah and Deliverer as they looked for. Since Paul would not tell them of a conquering king, who would head them in an insurrection against the mighty power of the Romans, they would listen to none of his instructions. Had he done this, we know that he would have gained their enthusiastic belief; but simply because they were disappointed in this,

they determined upon his destruction, by accusing him of doing that which they themselves were anxious to accomplish. They gathered a multitude of the dissolute and unprincipled rabble of the city, and in a disorderly tumult attacked the house of Jason, where the Apostle and his companions were lodged. These, indeed, prudently eluded the bigot rage of the multitude, but Jason and some others of the converts were seized and dragged before the judges. The old false accusation was lodged—that the subverters of the *peace* and government of the world were come to raise rebellion against the Roman emperor, in the name and cause of Jesus, whom they represented as their king. Such charges were totally false against men who preached peace on earth, and brotherly love, and submission to authority, as being constituted by God. The apostles did not attempt before such judges, and with such accusers, to justify their doctrine, or show its tendency, which they left to be done by their life and conduct.

But a wide field was before them, and instead of persisting in giving instruction to men who shut their ears against it, they went onwards to Berea. Here the Jews were men of more liberal and reflective minds than those of the capital of Macedonia. They listened, with willingness to believe, to the reasonings of Paul, and as these were all founded upon their own Scriptures, and drawn from the prophecies there contained, they daily searched those Scriptures, with a sincere desire to ascertain whether God had in truth visited and redeemed the children of Abraham. This was proving the "nobility" of their descent from the father of the faithful, and the result was corresponding—many of them believed, and along with them many also of the idolatrous Greeks of distinction, both male and female. The successful labours of Paul, however, were not allowed to proceed without interruption—the Thessalonian Jews hearing of the number of converts, came thither to stir up strife. It was the evil passions of the multitude

to which they applied, for we will find that in all the troubles which Paul had to encounter beyond Judea, it was his own countrymen, or the ignorant rabble, which raised them, while the learned and the great of this land of science and civilization looked on at first in general with indifference or contempt, considering the whole as the trifling or foolish disputes of ignorant barbarians.

This was the most southerly city of that country which in spiritual vision had prayed for help. The reception which the devoted Apostle of the Gentiles had hitherto met was persecution and threats of murder in every city he had visited. His associates, it seems, were not so obnoxious, for he had left Luke in Philadelphia, and he now left Silas and Timothy here. He went forward, by a toilsome journey of nearly two hundred miles, to Athens. This had long been the most renowned city of Greece, and its fame was more highly celebrated than any other on the face of the earth. The days of her unrivalled splendour had passed away since she had fallen under the iron tread of Roman power. But, even by the Romans, Athens was looked upon with veneration, as the sacred fountain of all learning and science, of philosophy and legislation, of the elegant arts and civilization. Multitudes from all quarters still flocked to this city, as the best school for acquiring, in the greatest perfection, every branch of polite or profound learning. Her inhabitants were looked upon as men of the most acute and inquisitive minds, constantly in search of something new. This was the birth-place of Socrates, the apostle of natural reason, who carried the inquiry of the human mind as far and as deep as human intellect, unaided by revelation, could ever go. He had even come to the conclusion that such a revelation was necessary to guide men in their search after truth. We can easily conceive with what mingled feelings of compassion and respect the great teacher of revealed truth would enter this city of philosophers, or *lovers of wisdom*, as her

learned men with seeming modesty called themselves. He had studied her literature and philosophy in his earlier years, and well knew all the sophistry as well as beauty of that mental science which they prosecuted with such eagerness and logical acuteness. Paul had determined with himself not to encounter these men of proud sophistry till the arrival of his companions, but while he walked through those gardens devoted to studious solitude, or the multitude of those gorgeous temples, which were the pride of the gay and volatile city, in which crowds of worshippers daily paid abject devotion to the senseless workmanship of their own hands, "his spirit was stirred within him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry," and he determined to bring the simplicity of the gospel before the congregated *wisdom* of Greece and of the world. In the synagogue, and to the Jewish proselytes, he first propounded the object of his mission, and in the forum he daily proclaimed the *new* doctrine. This, in one respect, was exactly to the taste of these idle speculators, who presumed that they had investigated all the regions of human knowledge, still the craving of their restless minds was constantly on the stretch for the excitement of something *new*. Such a teacher in such a city could not long escape notice. He was encountered by the Stoics and Epicureans, philosophers who in some point bore a little resemblance to the Pharisees and Sadducees of his own country. Whatever he could have done, Paul discoursed not to them in the rhetorical eloquence of their forum, or in the acute and unprofitable distinctions of their logical schools—he propounded at once and plainly the doctrine of man's salvation through the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the resurrection of the body, and a future judgment. This revealed truth of heaven was indeed something novel to these profound masters of human intellect, but it was so novel, that they concluded that the preacher was a "babbler," and his new doctrine "foolishness." They seemed, however, to have been bent on having

some amusement at least, and they carried this "setter forth of strange gods" before the court of Areopagus. This was the supreme of all the Athenian courts, from whose sentence there seems to have been no appeal, and so upright and virtuous were the judges reputed, that foreign nations willingly submitted their most important concerns to the award of their deliberations. One of the most important parts of their jurisdiction was to judge of all new opinions in religion, every thing connected with the worship of their gods, or the introduction of new deities. So august was this court considered, that to laugh in it was esteemed an unpardonable act of levity. They sat in the open air, and generally decided the causes that were brought before them under the darkness of night, lest they should be polluted with the contact of gross criminals, or lest they should be biassed for or against those brought before them, by their appearance. It is clear from the account given that the Apostle was brought before this awful court, but it does not appear whether it was with all the formalities and solemnities of its usual sittings, which were held only on the three last days of each month. It would rather seem that these *grave* philosophers and judges considered the trial as a piece of mockery and amusement altogether. But the teacher of truth is placed before the legal judges, the wisdom of God is arraigned at the tribunal of man, and whatever was the motive, and whatever the expectations of these *lovers of wisdom*, Paul addressed them not as a culprit suing for mercy, but as *their* instructor and judge. Luke gives us the substance of his address, and looking upon it as a mere human composition—whether we consider its chaste and powerful eloquence, the conclusiveness of its reasoning, or the impressive appeal to the conscience, and noblest feelings and aspirations of the human heart—we may safely pronounce it a speech that embodied the most important truths, and the most sublime intelligence, which had ever been uttered in the hearing of the wise

sons of Greece. He takes the subject of his address from an inscription on an altar "TO THE UNKNOWN GOD," in which they confessed their ignorance; informs them that he had come to preach to them of Him—boldly attacks the whole system of their idolatry as defective and inconsistent, however sincere and devoted they might be in its forms—proves that all their gorgeous temples and expensive sacrifices could not recommend them to that Being who bestowed all upon them—quotes their own poets to show that God was the infinite Creator of all, the omnipresent Ruler of the world—draws the conclusion that it was the duty of all to search after and know this Author of our being, and to enjoy his favour. He informs them, finally, that God had designedly permitted this acknowledged ignorance on their part, but had now accomplished the great deliverance of man—had revealed the whole plan of his truth to the world, and had sent forth his messengers to call all men to repent, and prepare for a future judgment at the tribunal of Christ Jesus—in proof of the truth of all which God had raised him from the dead. Here was neither superstition nor an unintelligible display of specious words, but a series of plain propositions, all resting upon the single fact of the resurrection of Jesus, which the Apostle was ready to prove. We are not told what was the deliberation of the judges, but the Epicureans, who believed neither in the overruling providence of God nor a future retribution, mocked at what they considered the folly of barbarous superstition; and the Stoics, who had some dim and confused notions of both, said they would hear the preacher again upon such a subject. The Apostle was dismissed, or permitted to retire, without any violence or condemnation, probably because these proud judges and vainer philosophers anticipated no danger from such a teacher of new doctrines, or because they did not think it worth their while to examine into the obvious conclusions which would follow, were such doctrines and such facts true. One of

his judges, however, Dionysius, was converted, and Damaris, his wife, has been supposed, along with some others.

This "eye of Greece," however, was in general blind to the light of truth. These self-satisfied searchers after wisdom pronounced the revelation of Heaven foolishness, and its teacher a picker up of idle tales. They were too deeply entrenched in the deceitfulness of their own sophistry—too superciliously proud of the imagined conquest of their own understanding—just as the Jews were too bigotedly attached to their own traditions, to listen to the revelation of Heaven, because it suited the preconceived notions of neither. Though Silas and Timothy had arrived to his aid, he thought it unnecessary to strive longer with men who, in the perverse pride of human reason, would not listen. He therefore proceeded onward to Corinth, the "other eye of Greece," the seat of equal refinement, and of almost equal pride in learning and philosophy, and at that time the residence of the Roman proconsul. Remembering the hostile or cold and contemptuous manner in which his doctrines had hitherto been received, he came to this city of dissolute luxury and carnal pride, "in weakness and fear, and much trembling." Even his ardent spirit seems to have been damped, and his zeal, so confident of success, to have yielded to cold despondency, when he looked to what appeared the hopeless contest before him. Yet he knew and felt the necessity which lay upon him, he knew that that cause in which he laboured was the cause of God, and that, therefore, it would and must succeed. Notwithstanding the contemptuous sneers of the wise men of Athens at him and his doctrine, he still resolved in the city whither he was going to "know and preach nothing but Christ and him crucified." At Corinth he met two converts, Aquila and Priscilla, lately banished from Italy, among the mutinous Jews, by the decree of Claudius, mentioned above. With these he abode, and laboured at the trade which he had learned in his

youth. This was unlike the teachers of Greece, whose instructions could only be procured at a high price. Paul gratuitously persuaded the Jews and Gentile proselytes every Sabbath day. For a considerable time his countrymen seem to have listened with an apathetic indifference to his reasonings, all their affections most probably absorbed by the mammon of this world, the besetting sin of their nation. Silas and Timothy had returned from visiting the churches of Macedonia, whither they had been sent from Athens, to comfort and encourage them to steadfastness amidst the temptations and persecutions which already lay heavily on them. His companions brought cheering accounts of the faith and patience of these churches, the first fruits of his labours in Europe. This encouraged the Apostle to deal more boldly and plainly with the Corinthian Jews, pressing upon them the great doctrine that Jesus was indeed their only Messiah, and setting before them the danger which they would incur by rejecting him. This awakened them from their indifference at last, and roused their zeal, but it was only to oppose him, and rail against him, and blaspheme the subject of his doctrine. With men of such a spirit it was vain either to argue or contend. He told them that he had fully justified himself by declaring the message of God—that their blood was now upon their own guilty heads—that he would thenceforth go to the Gentiles. He entered their synagogue no more, but preached in the house of Justus, a disciple who lived near the Jewish place of worship. Here he converted Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and many others, both Jews and Gentiles. He had not hitherto spent much time in any Grecian city, and probably designed soon to leave Corinth also, having, as he thought, discharged his duty, and sown the seed of truth. He had perhaps also been threatened with danger by his enraged countrymen, who would neither embrace the truth themselves, nor suffer others to do it, as far as lay in their power. He that had sent him from Asia

into Europe, and who, though unseen, was ever with him, appeared once again to encourage him to proclaim the truth fearlessly—that none should be permitted to hurt him, and that his success in that city would yet be signal. He therefore obeyed, and preached the Gospel a year and a half in Corinth.

But anxious concern and love for other churches were upon him also. The report of his fellow-labourers in regard to the condition of the believers in Macedonia was both cheering and distressful. They continued firm in faith and love to the truth, but this very steadfastness roused against them the rage of those “who pleased not God, and were contrary to all men.” The Apostle, who knew that he dwelt deep in their affections, but was prevented by Satan and his persecuting agents from visiting them personally, wrote a letter of encouragement, commending their faith, and patience, and brotherly love, and urging them to higher degrees in all Christian graces. He informed them of the certain and approaching retribution which was ready to be poured out in destruction upon all their enemies, and set before them the glorious reward which was reserved for them when Christ should come again to judge the world. This is believed to be the first Epistle which Paul wrote. The zeal and great success of the Apostle rankled in the turbulent spirit of the Jews. He had already made converts of several of their chief men, and, as usual with them, they determined upon revenge. They rose in tumultuous rage, seized upon Paul, and dragged him before Gallio the proconsul, accusing him as a breaker of the law, for teaching contrary to the doctrines of Moses, as they alleged, which were tolerated by the laws of the empire. Paul was ready to justify himself, but the proconsul, who, though no Christian, and caring little about such doctrines, knew the seditious character of the Jews, and who seems also to have known the conduct of the Apostle, and the tenor of his doctrines, drove them away with contempt, refusing

to interfere. Paul had friends among the multitude, it would seem, more than the Jews. These idolatrous Gentiles had marked the malice of his enemies, and though the cautious judge would neither encourage nor punish them, the Greeks had no such scruples. They seized upon Sosthenes, who had been elected president of the synagogue instead of Crispus, and who had urged on this charge against the Apostle, though he afterwards became his convert and fellow-labourer, and beat him in presence of the proconsul. This Gallio was elder brother of the eloquent philosopher Seneca, and is described by him as a mild and amiable man, but he took no interest either in upholding the Jewish worship, or examining into those doctrines which were calculated to overthrow it—he cared for none of these things.”

It has been thought, with good reason, that St Paul during this time visited and preached in the chief cities of Achaia and the Peloponnesus. He alludes to this in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians more than once, and from his mentioning all the saints in Achaia, we may conclude that he had laboured with success. St Luke, however, who seems not at that time to have been in his company, relates the events of these years very briefly. At his return he learned that the churches of Macedonia were still suffering from persecution, and though they were increasing in all Christian graces, yet that some prophetic expressions of his former letter in regard to the second coming of Christ had been misunderstood, and the notion had been propagated that this advent was at hand. The Apostle writes again in a similar strain of deep sympathy, and praise and encouragement, expressing the anxious desire which he had again to visit them, and to add to their spiritual gifts. But he very carefully warns them against being led into error in regard to Christ's coming to judgment—that that event should not take place till there was a general apostacy from the truth—till the Man of Sin should appear, and in the church of God usurp all the attributes

and privileges of Deity. It is evident from the allusions in this Epistle, and from the very anxious and earnest strain in which it is written, that false teachers had already endeavoured to pervert the minds of his converts, pretending to equal inspiration and power with St Paul, and that forged epistles had also been written in his name to the same effect. We have no mention of the names of these false teachers, but we know that their doctrine was not suppressed—that it afterwards broke out and obtained many believers, and ended in the definite shape of the Jewish notion of an immediate personal reign of the Messiah on earth. This is the first appearance of the belief of a millennial reign, which has since frequently been revived. In our days it is attended with few practical consequences, either good or bad; but in those days, when it was deeply tinged with the worst prejudices of Judaism, it was of the most mischievous and dangerous tendency.

St Paul having spent about two years in Macedonia and Greece, sailed again for Asia, but seems to have left most or all of his assistants behind him. He took Aquila and his wife, who seem to have been anxious to visit their native country, Pontus. Landing at Ephesus, and preaching in the synagogue there with favourable impressions, he refused to stop, as he had a vow at Jerusalem, but promised to visit them again. He therefore embarked, sailed along the coast, landed at Cæsarea, and kept the feast, probably the Passover, at Jerusalem. But as in that chief residence of the apostles there was no need of his labours, he came to Antioch, and having spent some time in that field of his early and zealous labours, set out to visit in order, and confirm and instruct for the third time all the churches which he had founded in Asia. This he did without stopping any length of time at any one period of his journey. It would seem that he found the truth spreading, and the churches under regular instructors, and he was anxious to visit, as he promised, the great city of Ephesus, the

mighty stronghold in all Asia of superstition and idolatry.

Here also the truth had been already preached by a zealous and eloquent forerunner of St Paul. Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, and a disciple of John the Baptist, deeply learned in the Scriptures, had preached the doctrine of repentance and preparation for the Messiah. Aquila had met and instructed him more accurately, showing that that Messiah was already come. He had gone to Corinth, however, before St Paul arrived at the capital of proconsular Asia. His labours had converted twelve, whom St Paul baptized in the name of Jesus, conferring on them the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, of which they had not heard, as such gifts were no privilege of the commission of the Baptist. He had in his former short visit received an invitation from the Jews to preach the doctrine of the Messiah. To this work he now set himself with his ardent zeal. Three months successively he laboured to persuade his countrymen to the belief of their Saviour. This was listening with longer patience than the Jews had been accustomed to do to his bold eloquence. Whether it was indifference, or an expectation that they would at last find the Messiah whom St Paul preached such a deliverer as would suit their prejudices, is not said. But their deep-rooted prejudices were at last aroused. The apparent willingness to believe which they had at first exhibited disappeared—they were hardened in their unbelief by those arguments which ought to have gained their enthusiastic faith, and slandered and railed at the Apostle before the multitude. As at Corinth, he left their synagogue, and continued to instruct the disciples, and all who were willing to listen to him, in a school belonging to Tyrannus, who was probably a Gentile convert. His success was equal to his zeal. Multitudes of both Jews and Gentiles from the whole of the province, which included Ionia, Acolia, and Lydia, heard him through the space of three years.

Ephesus was the favourite home of

superstition. Here was the celebrated temple of Diana, built at the expense of all Asia, and adorned with gorgeous pillars and noble ornaments by hundreds of kings—it was the most splendid monument of idolatry built by men, and ranked among the wonders of the world. But it was also the seat of sorcery and magic, and pretended miracles. We learn from Josephus that the Jews practised these gainful deceptions, professing that they had got the secret of Solomon for exorcising all evil spirits, and making them obedient to their will. The Ephesian magic was also celebrated. Their sorcerers, by certain mystic spells and incantations, in which they employed the names of the elements, and of truth pretended to expel spirits, to cure all diseases, and guard against all danger. But the wondrous deeds of these “Ephesian letters,” and the fabulous efficacy of Solomon’s magic, were soon detected to be vile impostures, before the name of Jesus and Jehovah, as the magicians of Egypt fled before the rod of God in the hand of Moses. In this place of pretended enchantment, this gorgeous haunt of the enemy of truth, Paul was commissioned to establish the doctrines of the cross by mighty miracles. Peter’s shadow passing over the sick in the streets of Jerusalem cured them. and at Ephesus, aprons and handkerchiefs carried from the body of Paul healed all diseases, and expelled evil spirits. The Jewish exorcists pretended to imitate this by calling the name of Jesus over those whom they wished to cure, believing that there was a supernatural power in the name, whatever was the faith of him who pronounced it. Seven sons of a Jewish priest, of the name of Sceva, attempted this in the case of a demoniac. The evil spirit confessed his knowledge of Jesus and of Paul, but springing upon these impious pretenders, overcame them all, and drove them away naked and wounded. We conclude that the refractory spirit yielded to that power in the hands of Paul, for it is added that “these things were known to all the Jews and Greeks, that fear fell upon

all, and the name of Jesus was magnified.” The pretended sorcerers were convinced that there was more than the magic delusion of Ephesian letters and mystic muttering here. Many of them were converted, and, confessing their former imposture, brought together their magic books and burned them publicly. As a proof of the extent of the former superstition, and the present triumph of a divine power and better faith, Luke mentions that the calculated amount of the price of the books was fifty thousand pieces of silver. We do not know the coin here meant—if it was the Jewish shekel, the sum in English money would be L.7500, if the Roman denarius, only L.1562, 10s. The act, however, was sufficient proof of the power of the truth, and of the sincerity of those who made the sacrifice.

Such was his amazing success here, but messengers from Corinth brought word that dissension and gross abuses had arisen there, through the intrusion of false teachers, and the carnal minds of many of those who professed to believe. The zealous Apostle was extremely desirous to go thither himself, to assert his authority and reclaim those who had been so grievously led astray. His duty at Ephesus, however, prevented this, and he sent two of his assistants, Erastus and Timothy, Apollos declining, in the meantime, to go to a place where probably he had been offended or ill-treated. While he waited for the report of his messengers, a deputation of three (Stephanas, Achaicus, and Fortunatus, probably a Jew, Greek, and Roman) came to him with a letter to take his advice upon the subject of their differences. This was a proof that they still looked to him as their spiritual father, and in the letter which he sent in reply he strongly urges them to unity, asserts his own authority against the false teachers who had called in question his apostolic authority, severely condemns the many abuses of which he had learned, and shows their inconsistency with the profession of faith which they had made, and

lays down rules for the becoming and profitable exercise of their spiritual gifts. Promising soon to visit them himself, he sent Titus to supply his necessary absence.

Paul's life was an incessant contest with difficulties and dangers. The sun of truth, through his means, had been made to arise on those regions of darkness and idolatry, and the multitudes who rejoiced in its light were daily more and more increasing. But those who love the deeds of darkness hate the light; those who make their gain of the follies and ignorance of men oppose all who turn them to wisdom. The worship of the statue of Diana, which was believed to have been formed by the hands of Jupiter, and to have fallen from heaven, was deserted, and the profits of the silversmith Demetrius, who made models of that gorgeous temple, with its idol, for the household adoration and the protection of her deluded votaries, were in danger of being ruined. Perceiving this, he called a meeting of the craft, and, in a bitter speech, inveighed against the impiety of the innovator Paul, who had the presumption to teach them that those were no gods which were made with hands. He showed them that, if such an assertion as this were to be believed, in the first place, they would be ruined, and, in the second, that the great Diana of the Ephesians would be despised, and the magnificence of her temple, which drew crowds of worshippers from every quarter of the world, would go to decay. The effect of this inflammatory speech was an immediate and violent tumult in the city, in which Paul and his followers were nearly sacrificed to the rage of the blind multitude. They seized Gaius and Aristarchus, and hurried them to the theatre, with the intention of exposing them to the wild beasts. Paul wished to brave the danger and expostulate with the mob, but his more prudent friends dissuaded the attempt. That insensate rage exhausted itself in wild and enthusiastic exclamations for two hours, in which nothing was heard but "great is Diana of the Ephesians." The town-clerk, as he is called (probably the se-

cretary of the Roman proconsul, or the clerk of those asiarchs, or presidents of the games, who had befriended Paul), at last called the noisy multitude to a sense of the impropriety of their conduct, by showing them its illegality, and the danger they incurred themselves of being called to account for their own behaviour. Whether all these powerful men, who interfered in behalf of Paul and his friends, were believers, is to be questioned. Some of them probably were, and all bore testimony to the prudence with which he conducted himself.

But, in such a state of the passions of the idolatrous population, he could no longer remain at Ephesus either with safety to himself or benefit to his disciples. Longing, therefore, for a more active field he took leave of them, and Titus not having returned from Corinth, or sent him any account of the effect of his letter and mission, he resolved to proceed thither himself by way of Macedonia. Luke has given us no particular account of this journey, but we gather several passages of it from the second Epistle which Paul wrote to the Church at Corinth before he arrived thither. It seems that he was excessively anxious about the state of matters there; for while at Troas, and still looking for the return of his messenger, "though a door was opened to him," he had "no rest in his spirit," because of the delay of Titus, and proceeded into Macedonia. Here the usual opposition encountered him, "without were fightings, within were fears." In his own sufferings he gloried, but the resistance of wicked men to the progress of that cause, in the success of which his soul was on fire, cast a dark cloud of despondency over him. But, when Titus at last came, and gave him an account of the complete success of his expostulation in the former letter, his joy was enhanced above measure; and though he had proposed and promised to visit the Corinthians, his anxiety for the welfare and peace of the churches of Macedonia detained him some time longer. To compensate for this absence, he wrote

another letter to the same church from Philippi, which is in many respects a supplement to that of the former year. We find the same humility of spirit, yet also dignified and lofty assertion of the authority with which he was entrusted. The indomitable energy of character, the quenchless thirst after everything great and excellent, which inspired his heart, and, in his former state of ignorance, burned as a fire within him, and urged him on to the strife of glory and worldly ambition; every thought of exulting pride, every sublime imagination, were all brought "into captivity to the obedience of Christ." He glories, but it is in those things which were once his shame, and hatred, and contempt—in all distresses, and oppositions, and persecutions, in weariness, and labour, and fasting. If he can only be assured of their continuing and advancing in the faith of the doctrines of the cross, which he had so fully taught them, all his labours and sufferings would be more than fully rewarded. We know that these powerful and deeply-pathetic epistles had their due effect. We quote the following from an epistle to them from the Roman Clement, Paul's fellow-labourer, "whose name," he says, "was in the book of life"—"What strangers that came among you did not take honourable notice formerly of the firmness and fulness of your faith? Who of them did not admire the sobriety and gentleness of your godly spirit in Christ? Who did not extol the liberal practice of your Christian hospitality? How admirable was your sound and mature knowledge of divine things? Ye were wont to do all things without respect to persons, and ye walked in the ways of God in due subjection to your pastors, and submitting yourselves the younger to the elder."

Having settled the affairs of the Macedonian churches, and preached the Gospel probably as far west as Illyricum and the shores of the Adriatic, he came at last into Greece, and spent three months in reforming abuses, and giving instructions to the churches of Corinth and the neighbourhood. It was while he

was here on the present occasion that he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, whom he had not yet seen, but promised to visit. It is from beginning to end a most closely argumentative discourse in proof of the necessity of a revelation from God, and of the truth of the Christian doctrine, of its nature and necessary tendency to sanctification. From the number of salutations in the last chapter, we conclude that there was already a numerous body of believers in the imperial city. The names indicate that these were chiefly Greeks or Jewish converts, though there are several Roman names among them. The churches of Macedonia and Achaia, at his request, had made a liberal collection for the poor believers at Jerusalem, and he, with a deputation from the Greek churches, resolved to carry it to Jerusalem. Being made aware of a plot of the relentless Jews to rob and murder him at Cenchrea, the eastern part of Corinth, he went by the way of Macedonia. The Passover week was past, and he determined to be in Jerusalem before the day of Pentecost. The Lord now set before him a journey to the utmost bounds of the west; and this being the fifty-eighth year from the birth of Christ, and his own age being nearly equal to that, he anticipated that this would be the last time of directing and encouraging the Christians of Asia. Still he lingered with fond regret in that land of his youthful years and earliest labours. At Troas he preached till midnight, being to depart on the morrow. A young man, being overcome with sleep, and having fallen down three storeys, and being taken up dead, he restored to life. Taking ship at Assos, they coasted along—and the reader cannot fail to note the faithful particularity with which St Luke, who had again joined his company, marks their progress—they landed at Miletus, and sent for the elders of the neighbouring church of Ephesus. To them he gave his parting address, reminding them with what laborious diligence he had preached the truth among them for three years.

Now that he was to see their face no more, that he was going to Jerusalem, where bonds and afflictions awaited him, he charged them to take heed to themselves, and to the flock which God had committed to their charge: he warned them of the false teachers that would come among them, that would even rise among themselves, and draw away many after them. He committed them therefore to the grace of God, which alone was able to establish and preserve them as heirs of salvation. He then fell upon his knees and prayed with them all on the shore. It is most affecting to see one inspired with such an ardent love for the best interests of his fellow-men, who had renounced the brightest prospects of honour and worldly ambition, for the purpose of devoting his unrivalled talents to a life of labour, and poverty, and incessant danger, for the sake of those who drove him from city to city, as if he had been a monster of iniquity and a pest of human society:—it is most affecting and sublime to witness that love grow stronger and that zeal flame higher, in proportion as he saw the lowering clouds of danger thicken and darken over his head, and that storm raised by the very men for the love of whom he encountered all this fight of afflictions, and exposed his life every day. To the Ephesian pastors it was deeply impressive; and that mournful parting was hallowed with a shower of tears of the deepest sorrow, and sympathy, and filial reverence.

St Paul and his companions sailed away and landed at Tyre, where he was warned by the disciples of the place, in the spirit of prophecy, not to go to Jerusalem. At Casarea this warning was given in a more direct and impressive manner. They stopped some time in the house of Philip the deacon and evangelist. While here, Agabus the prophet came from Jerusalem, and taking St Paul's girdle, bound his own hands and feet, and declared, in the name of the Holy Spirit, that the Jews would so bind St Paul, and deliver him over to the Gentiles. Such repeated intimations of certain dan-

ger and probable destruction made the companions of Paul, and the Christians of the place, earnestly and passionately beseech him to defer his journey at this time. These were indeed prophetic announcements of what was to befall him; but ever since he had enlisted as a devoted soldier of the cross, he had encountered dangers as great as this. His duty was before him, and in discharge of that he regarded not his own safety—he regarded no threats, or danger at the hands of man—"he was ready not only to be bound, but also to die at Jerusalem, for the name of the Lord Jesus." He had not yet publicly borne witness in the face of such danger to the truth and divinity of that cause which, in his ignorance, he had so fiercely denounced, and so cruelly persecuted in Jerusalem; and when they saw his determined self-devotion, they ceased farther to importune him, saying, "The will of the Lord be done."

Paul and his fellow-labourers, therefore, proceeded to Jerusalem with the charitable contribution of the Gentile churches of Asia and Europe. They were gladly received by James and the elders, to whom Paul gave an account of all his labours and success among the distant nations which he had visited. These accounts inspired them with unfeigned joy; but they were also aware of the slanderous reports which the bigoted Jews of these nations had brought against Paul, as if he had taught all the Jews to despise the laws of Moses, and warned him that the many thousands of their countrymen who were converted were still zealous for those institutions which distinguished them from other nations, that these would hear of his arrival, and would make an investigation into the matter, which might lead him into trouble. They therefore advised him to perform publicly in the Temple some of the ceremonial rites of Judaism, and practically prove to the Jews that the reports against him were unfounded. We will not venture to say what Paul would have done had the matter been

left to his own decision, nor will we venture to say that James the Just was Judaizing too much, and compromising the principles of the gospel in timid and ill-judged deference to the prejudices of his countrymen. We know that Peter, a man of much greater constitutional boldness than James, did so in a city of the Gentiles, and in circumstances when such temporizing led to much more serious consequences. But in things indifferent Paul could "be all things to all men, that he might gain some," and he well knew that the observance of the Mosaic rites was necessary to secure to the Jews the possession of their civil privileges. All the apostles had agreed that such observance was not necessary to salvation, and so far the Apostle of the Gentiles was willing to show countenance to institutions venerable from their antiquity, but whose meaning and force had now ceased since the substance and reality had come instead of the shadow and the type. He, therefore, entered the Temple with four men who had a vow, and took upon him the expense of the sacrifices enjoined in similar cases. But before the seven days of purification were ended, he was observed in the court of the Temple by some of the Asiatic Jews, who immediately showed their unabated hatred against him, by crying out that this was their great enemy, the apostate who every where taught doctrines subversive of the law, destructive of the institutions and worship of their fathers, and that he was even then showing his contempt and profaning the Temple by introducing Gentiles into its sacred precincts. All these were false and slanderous accusations, but they were sufficient to rouse the multitude into a tumultuous rage. They dragged Paul out of the Temple, shut the gates, and would have instantly beat him to death, as they had done Stephen nearly thirty years before, with Paul's own concurrence. But the Roman garrison was near, and the heathen soldiers rescued the Apostle of the Gentiles out of the hands of his countrymen. Lysias,

the tribune, and commander of the Roman legion who were stationed in the castle, bound him with chains, and demanded who he was, and what he had done. Where all answered in confusion this could not be known, and Paul was led away as a prisoner. But though apparently in the jaws of destruction, the dauntless Apostle forgot not the great object of his commission—he requested liberty of the Roman officer to address his infuriated countrymen. The request was granted, when Lysias understood that Paul was not an Egyptian imposter and robber, as he supposed. He addressed them in their own language, gave an account of his life, of his former zeal for the law, of his bitter hatred and persecution of the Christians, and called upon the high priest and elders to witness the truth of his declarations. He then gave an account of the miraculous nature of his conversion at the very time when his zeal was hottest in persecution of the Christians, told them of the anxious desire which he then had to make known to the Jews the causes of that conversion, which, in such circumstances as those in which he stood, would have been a complete proof that it was by the immediate interference of God—that God, however, had commanded him while praying, and in a heavenly vision, to leave that city, for the Jews would not listen to him—that he must go to the Gentiles. However reasonable such an argument was, and however convincing it should have been, the very mention of a mission to the Gentiles drove the Jews into more than their former fanatic rage. Lysias, not understanding the language of the Jews in which Paul spoke, concluded that he had given them some grievous offence, and according to the barbarous custom of the country, commanded that he should be examined by torture till he should confess his crime. Paul pleaded his privilege of a Roman citizen, and was exempted from this cruelty and degradation. Even Lysias had purchased that high honour, and was alarmed at having inflicted the indignity

of chains upon the arms of a fellow-citizen of the empire.

The tribune now befriended Paul, and next day summoning the chief priest and the Sanhedrim, brought him before them to find out judicially what was laid to his charge. Ananias presided as high priest, but whether he had any title to an office which he had either purchased or usurped, he was not clothed in the robes of his sacred function, and he behaved altogether unworthily of it. Paul began by saying that he had hitherto "lived in all good conscience before God and man"—upon which Ananias commanded him to be struck on the mouth. Paul was perfectly justified in resenting such a gross and illegal indignity, and prophesied the vengeance of God upon such an unjust hypocrite. Seeing the futility of any attempt at reasoning with such prejudiced judges, or of justifying himself, he turned their own weapons against themselves. Either from personal knowledge of his judges, or from their dress or conversation, he perceived that they were composed partly of Pharisees and partly of Sadducees; he therefore cried that he was a Pharisee, of the strictest sect, and that the chief charge against him amounted to his believing the resurrection of the dead. This good policy made that brood of serpents turn upon each other with their accustomed mutual rancour. The words of the sacred narrative even lead us to suppose that these dignified and venerable judges came to blows. The diminutive Paul was in danger of being torn to pieces in this undignified scuffle, but was rescued by the Roman soldiers, and carried back to the castle of Antonia.

Such were still the judges of St Paul's beloved country, and such was the justice he was to expect at their hands. But He that judgeth justly appeared to him by night, told him to be of good cheer—that as the plots of the Jews would be defeated—that as he had borne witness to the truth in the capital of his own nation, so should he do in the capital of the Roman world. But St Paul was an object of too

much hatred and fear to all the Jews so to escape. More than forty bound themselves under a vow neither to eat nor drink till they had murdered him. They hesitated not to inform the priests and elders of their execrable plot, and these scrupled not to countenance them in it, and to give their aid to accomplish such an object. This was to be done by bringing St Paul again before the council, on the pretence of a more orderly examination; and these blind zealots were to murder him on his way. They were, however, caught in their own snare. A nephew of St Paul discovered the plot; it was made known to the governor of the castle, and defeated; and we may presume that these zealous upholders of the law were absolved from their oath by the conscientious priesthood, who thus supported the laws of Moses, and the statutes of God.

In order to secure St Paul from such implacable malice of the Jews, Lysias sent him by night, with a sufficient guard of soldiers, to Cæsarea, where Felix, the then president of Judea, resided, informing him by letter of the accusations brought against the prisoner, of his imminent danger if he was kept at Jerusalem, and his own conviction of St Paul's innocence. Felix, as we learn from Tacitus, was of base origin, and a man of the utmost rapacity and cruelty, and stained with vice and crime of the worst description. Still he was a Roman judge, and in a public matter of this kind, the stern laws of that people, even in the administration of a corrupt judge, were safer for Paul than the relentless hatred of his own countrymen. Here he was kept till Ananias and the elders, with a Roman advocate named Tertullus, came, at the appointment of Felix, to substantiate their charge. Luke gives the substance of the orator's speech, which consists merely in fulsome flattery of the judge, whom every Jew bitterly detested, and totally false allegations against the accused, as a profaner of the temple, a rebel against the government, a disturber of the peace, and a breaker of the laws. He said they would have judged him

according to their own laws, but were prevented by the tribune Lysias, who had rescued him from summary punishment. The witnesses to all these grave charges were Ananias and the elders, who declared that they were all true. With that perfect confidence in his own rectitude of conduct and the goodness of his cause, which a just and virtuous man alone can possess, Paul appealed to the justice of the president, who had been seven years in that office, denied every one of the charges which they had brought against him, and defied them to the proof. The charge of being of the sect of the Nazarenes, or Christians, he admitted, but showed that that belief was what all their prophets taught. There were many Christians in Cesarea, and Felix had the means of knowing their character sufficiently to be aware that Paul was unjustly accused. He had his own selfish object to serve, however, and delayed judgment. Paul was kept a prisoner, but in such free custody that all his friends had liberty to visit him.

We may presume that Paul, though a prisoner, was not idle, and that the Christians of that place availed themselves of his instructions. His limbs were fettered, but his mind was free, and his conscience was pure, and he knew that the word of eternal truth could not be bound. A prisoner of such fame excited the curiosity of the infamous Drusilla, who desired to hear the Apostle's doctrine from his own lips. She was a Jewess, the daughter of that Agrippa who had been struck in judgment by the hand of God in that city, and, like most of that family, was unprincipled and licentious. She was married to Azizus king of the Emisera, as we learn from Josephus, and like Herodias, was living in open adultery with Felix. Before this arbiter of his life, Paul with fearless fidelity assumed the character of judge—he adapted the preaching of Christianity to the characters to whom he spoke, and “reasoned of righteousness, and temperance, and judgment to come,” or of justice in his public capacity of judge, of continence

and chastity, and the certainty of a tribunal hereafter, before which all, great as well as small, should stand. The powerful reasoning of the Apostle bore so clearly upon the conscience of this corrupt judge, that he trembled before the prisoner whose life was in his hands. We are not told what effect the unpalatable truth had upon the mind of Drusilla, but in either it could be only a passing sentiment of terror and remorse. Both continued to live on in all the gross enormities of their former conduct.

Paul remained a prisoner two years, and no farther attempts seem to have been made by the Jews to procure his condemnation. Felix knew that Paul had the command of money, and the avaricious judge, measuring others by himself, thought that a bribe would be offered for his release. Multitudes of robbers and murderers had been dismissed for such a motive, at the instance of Paul's accuser, Ananias, therefore he frequently sent for him and communed with him, but no offer of such a nature was made, and we have the best reason to know that he did not covet the treasures of a more enduring kind which the Apostle had to bestow. For his cruelty and oppression he was at last recalled, and Festus came as his successor. In him the Jews expected a judge who would more readily listen to their charges, and the high priest again made an effort for the destruction of Paul. Festus, who seems to have known their character, and suspected their murderous plot, would not bring Paul to Jerusalem, but complied so far as to promise another hearing of his accusers at Casarea. Their accusations were as grievous and unfounded as ever. They seem to have urged that they could establish and prove them all, provided they had the prisoner in Jerusalem. They knew at least that this was the only chance by which they could rid themselves of such a dreaded enemy as they thought Paul. Festus would have gratified his turbulent subjects in this respect, caring less for the life of an unimportant prisoner than to secure the applause of the sacer-

dotal demagogues. But Festus was the representative of Nero, and as Casarea was the Roman tribunal of the province, Paul's consent was necessary to transfer the trial to any other locality. He knew too well the fate which they designed for him, and the certain injustice he would meet with there, and stood to his privilege as a Roman citizen, which he knew even Festus durst not violate—he appealed to the imperial tribunal at Rome. Such an appeal put a stop to all farther proceedings, even had Festus been as anxious to condemn the Apostle as the Jews were to destroy him, and after deliberating with his council, he allowed and sanctioned the protest.

Before that, however, Paul was destined to plead his own cause, and that of his Lord, before other great men of his nation. Agrippa and his sister, Bernice, came from Galilee to pay their respects to the new governor, who mentioned the case of Paul, and the difficulties he had experienced in it, upon which the Jewish king expressed his desire of hearing this celebrated teacher of the doctrines of Jesus. Next day Paul was brought before the court, where, besides Agrippa and Festus, and the shameless Bernice, all the chief men of the city attended. This array of royal magnificence, or civil dignity and military power, did not daunt the fearless Apostle, who gloried in all that he had suffered and done in the persecuted cause of Christ. He expressed his happiness that he had it once more in his power to defend himself against the false accusations of the Jews, and to proclaim the doctrines which he taught before the king and that dignified assembly. As he had done before the Jews, he here gave the narrative of his conversion, stating the doctrines in the bigoted belief of which he had been educated, showing that all the prophecies of their own scriptures pointed to a deliverer, who was to be slain, and raised from the dead—he told how he was miraculously convinced that Jesus was indeed the great Saviour promised, and how he had felt compelled to preach in his name to Jew

and Gentile—that he had proclaimed nothing else but the doctrines of such salvation, and resurrection from the dead through Jesus. Such new and wonderful doctrines struck the Roman procurator with astonishment, and the first impression on his mind was, that the eloquent orator was a raving enthusiast. He exclaimed, "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning," or deep study of the law, "doth make thee mad." He calmly replied that he spoke only the words of truth and soberness, and appealed to the knowledge of Agrippa whether all that he had said was not contained in the prophecies and doctrines of their own Scriptures, and had not been fulfilled in the death and resurrection of Christ. The king knew the truth of the declaration, had felt the force of the reasoning, and confessed that he was almost persuaded to be a Christian. This drew from the Apostle this noble and unequalled burst of Christian philanthropy, "I would to God that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds." Paul, the prisoner, loaded with chains, and the object of execration to the Jews, is more worthy of admiration than the mightiest conquerors with applauding myriads in their train. The judges deliberated, and Agrippa declared that Paul might have been set at liberty had he not appealed to Casar. He did not think fit to withdraw it, and it was resolved that he should be sent to Rome.

Thus this great Apostle had four times an opportunity of stating before his assembled countrymen, and the highest authorities of the land, the truth of those doctrines which he formerly so fiercely persecuted. The priests knew the truth of all the *facts* upon which he founded his belief, and he challenged them to the disproof. We cannot doubt that they were as eager to accomplish that, if they had had it in their power, as to put Paul himself to death. Their not venturing to do so, nor even to contradict his statement, is proof sufficient that they could not; that they could produce no evidence

to show that Paul was an imposter. The doctrines which he taught, the conclusions which he drew, necessarily followed from the resurrection of Jesus. Had not the Jews been utterly blinded they must have seen this, and been persuaded to believe, with rapturous delight, that Jesus, whom they had crucified, was indeed their Messiah. But their inveterate prejudices, which were invincible by all proof and all argument, have served this good purpose to all ages—they have deprived the gainsayer of the pretence that the resurrection of Christ, and the propagation of his doctrine, were the fond delusions of an enthusiastic and bigoted nation, who, in the hour of their adversity and depression, clung to the visionary hope of a Deliverer and deliverance which existed only in their own heated fancy. That truth made its way in opposition to all their most rancorous prejudices and all their fondest hopes. Paul has ever been considered as the most striking instance of the power of truth overcoming all these prejudices, and producing a perfect revolution in the character.

The Apostle being thus delivered from all the murderous expectations of the Jews, by the controlling power of the Romans, Festus resolved to send him to Rome, whither he had transferred his cause. Several of his friends and assistants who had attended him on his visit to Jerusalem, and had been with him during his imprisonment, resolved to accompany him, not ashamed of his bonds, nor afraid of the danger that might lie before all of them. Among these were Aristarchus and Luke, who gives a very graphic and particular account of the dangerous voyage. Paul was treated kindly by the centurion Julius, to whose custody he was committed. He permitted him to land at Sidon, and most probably on the island of Crete, where the ship with which they had been transferred lay for some time. It is not improbable that he left Titus here on this occasion to preach the gospel in that populous and large island. But the end of September was come, and though the trading vessel in which they

sailed was large, the terrible equinoctial storms of that sea were at hand, and it was revealed to Paul that imminent danger was over them. He warned the centurion of this, and advised that they should delay sailing till spring, but his advice was neglected. The dreadful Euroclydon—the tempestuous Levanter, as it is now called, came down upon them in all its fury. The hurricane continued at least two weeks, without their seeing sun or stars, and in the imperfect navigation of those days they were driven onward without knowing whither. Paul, who had experienced the more cruel storms of human rage, knew in whose hand his life was, and was calm in the midst of this fury of the elements. The angel of God also appeared to cheer and inform him that no life should be lost in the approaching shipwreck—that “God had given him all that sailed with him.” They were at last cast on shore on the island Melita, which there is good reason to suppose is the same that is now called Malta, though others, without any good grounds, try to prove that it was a small island of the same name, in the Adriatic Gulf, on the coast of Illyricum. Paul was the means of saving the lives of the numerous passengers, amounting to two hundred and seventy-six. The mariners would have saved themselves by escaping in the boats when the ship was driven into the shallows, but Paul, though he had received the divine assurance that all should escape, did not, like a fatalist, dispense with the necessity of prudence and human exertions, and warned the centurion of the intended desertion. There were more prisoners than he, and the soldiers proposed that they should be killed rather than escape, but the centurion, from a friendly feeling to Paul, prevented this cruelty, and all got safe to land when the ship ran aground.

Here they were detained till spring rendered sailing practicable; and St Paul wrought many miracles, healing the diseases of all who came to him, and, we have every reason to suppose, instructing his fellow passengers, and the inhabitants

of Melita, in those doctrines which are the remedy for all the spiritual diseases of the soul. After three months they sailed from Italy and landed at Puteoli, where they found Christian converts. These requested St Paul to stop with them; and the centurion, who seems to have been thoroughly convinced of the innocence of his prisoner, and had all along shown him great kindness, complied, and delayed proceeding for seven days. The arrival of the great Apostle was known by the Christians at Rome, to whom he had already written an epistle; and they came from the city to meet him, some as far as fifty, others as far as thirty miles. Such a circumstance was cheering to St Paul in the highest degree, and he received it as an intimation that God was with him, and would prosper this visit. When they reached the city, he was not committed to close custody with the rest of the prisoners, but was allowed to live in a hired lodging of his own, guarded by a soldier, to whom, according to the Roman custom, he was bound by a chain. To these "bonds of the Gospel," which were fixed round his right wrist, he frequently alludes in the letters which he wrote while at Rome. He is supposed to have arrived in the spring of A. D. 60, in the 7th of the reign of Nero.

It would appear that that last and most brutal of all the Cæsars was either not in the city, or not at leisure to attend to the case of such a prisoner. St Paul, therefore, had full liberty to improve his time as he pleased. He called his own countrymen, the unbelieving Jews, to explain why he had appealed against the judges of Jerusalem, and that he had not come thither to accuse them, but only to justify himself. They appointed a day when they would hear at greater length the doctrines of Christianity from his lips. When that arrived, many came to his house; and, from morning till evening, he proved, out of the writings of Moses and all the prophets, that in Jesus whom he preached, the promises of God were all fulfilled, and the only "hope of

Israel" was realized. Some believed, and others remained in their unbelief. When he observed this invincible resistance to the clearest proof, he warned them, with compassionate displeasure, that the prophetic curse of God would be fulfilled upon them—that he would give them up to the curse of their own hard and impenitent hearts, and judicial blindness of mind. He had discharged his duty to them, and he would now instruct the Gentiles, who would listen and believe. Here we lose the all important guidance of the "beloved physician, Luke," who tells us, in one comprehensive sentence, that "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no one forbidding him."

During these two years' imprisonment, the churches in Asia and Europe, which acknowledged him as their spiritual father, were naturally anxious about the welfare and safety of the great Apostle, and sent deputations of their pastors to minister to him, and aid him in the extensive work which was before him. From the nature of the charges that were against him, he was not allowed, and, if he had been allowed, perhaps he would not have judged it safe or prudent, to preach in public. But all men had liberty of resorting to him, and the good report of Julius would dispose the respectable people of Rome to entertain—first, no little curiosity about him, and when they gratified this, must have formed a high opinion of him. From his Epistle to his beloved Philippian church, we learn that several individuals of the household or court of the diabolical Nero himself were converted to Christianity. It has even been supposed that the empress Sabina Paphæa herself secretly favoured him and his doctrines. Jerome says that "he turned the house of Christ's persecutor into a church," and we learn from the various Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians,

which he wrote from Rome, that the truth prevailed, that many embraced it, and that there was an ample field of labour among those and others ready to listen, for himself, and for the many zealous friends who attended him. We have no account of the trial of his cause, nor do we even know certainly whether the Jewish priests sent witnesses against him; but he was finally released in the spring of A.D. 62 or 63, having been fully acquitted. Before he left Italy, and after his release, he is supposed to have written his Epistle to the Hebrews. In this most important and powerful treatise, he embodies the sum of the arguments, which we may suppose that at various times he had used to convince his countrymen. From beginning to end the reasoning is clearly consecutive and convincing. He shows how throughout the whole law and prophecies of the Old Testament there is a uniform reference to a more perfect scheme of revelation and of worship, which was to be fulfilled—that God from the very beginning looked down through all the generations of time, and superintended the whole economy of Sinai in such a way as to prepare for and introduce that of the gospel. While the writer shows the profoundest knowledge of the meaning and purpose of the old dispensation, he gives a most beautiful commentary upon it, and connects it with the new, setting forth the unity of design contemplated in both, and how it is brought out in its perfect form in the gospel—shows in many points how the outward forms and institutions of the first dispensation were only types and shadows, which had no spiritual signification, except when seen by faith as having reference to the latter, and urges faith and holiness and perfect obedience as the great object of all God's revelations and dispensations of religion to men. The chief argument of the Epistle to the Galatian churches is the same, but directed principally against the dangerous errors of those Judaizing teachers, who engrafted the now antiquated and abrogated observances of the

Mosaic ritual upon the pure spirituality of the gospel, and inculcated the necessity of keeping them as essential to the salvation of believers in Christ. From some expressions in this latter Epistle, however, it is probable that it was written before Paul left Asia, and as has been supposed, from Antioch, shortly after the apostolic synod of Jerusalem.

In the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews Paul promises to visit them soon. But he had formerly mentioned in his Epistle to the Romans his intention of visiting Spain. In the Epistle of his fellow-labourer Clement to the Corinthians, it is said that Paul preached the gospel to “the utmost bounds of the west,” which expression, used by one residing in Italy, has been reasonably thought to mean that he visited Spain, and perhaps Britain and Gaul. This is the general statement also of the early writers of church history, though no particulars are given of that visit. If he did visit the far west and the isles of the ocean, as his zeal and unwearied energy both urged and enabled him to do, though now above sixty years old, he must have done it hurriedly, and scattered the seeds of the truth, as one who looked to the termination of his labours. We know that he again returned to the east. The Jewish polity was now tottering to its fall, and every thing internal and external betokened the speedy fulfilment of the denunciation of their rejected Deliverer. The murderous zealots exercised their cruelty upon all sects indiscriminately, and the Roman governors became more and more despotic and reckless of human life, and of the consequences of their conduct. We shall suppose that Paul visited and comforted the suffering believers of Judea according to his promise. We also find in the conclusion of his most affectionate letter to Philemon of Colosse, while a prisoner at Rome, in behalf of the convert slave Onesimus, who had deserted his master's service, that he requests Philemon to provide him a lodging. After visiting Jerusalem, we shall sup-

pose that he once more travelled thither over the field of his early labours, encouraging all to persevere in adherence to the truth. It is evident from the Epistle to Titus that Paul had preached some time in Crete, and that there were numerous converts and churches there, which Titus was left to set in order. If we suppose with Macknight, that this Epistle was written from Colosse, we can trace the probable route of the Apostle afterwards. He had been, contrary to his expectation, when he left Ephesus, delivered out of the mouth of the lion, and if we suppose that the First Epistle to Timothy was written after that to Titus, he had again visited that city. From this he passed by his former route of Troas into Macedonia, proposing to winter at Nicopolis on the Adriatic Gulf, whither he had asked Titus to come to him from Crete. We can only conjecture, not with great certainty, that he afterwards visited that island, taking Corinth in his way, where Erastus left him, and Trophimus fell sick at Miletum, a town in Crete.

But now began the first general persecution of the Christians by Nero. He had become universally odious from the strong suspicion that he had set fire to the imperial city, that he might enjoy the pleasure of seeing what the sack of Troy was like, and have the high satisfaction of singing some verses of Homer descriptive of the event, while it was going on under his eyes. To divert the public hatred from himself, he turned it against the Christians, who were objects of hatred to the dissolute Romans. An "immense multitude" of them were put to death by every kind of the most horrid torture which savage cruelty could invent. These scenes are described by Tacitus, who probably witnessed them in his early youth, and by Juvenal and Martial. Some were covered with the skins of wild beasts, and hunted to death by dogs; many were crucified, others were wrapped round in clothes saturated with pitch and sulphur, and chained to stakes that they might give light while they thus burned to death

during the night. At what time of this fiery persecution St Paul returned to Rome we do not find recorded, but all ancient writers agree that he did return to Rome at this time to encourage the Christians to bear with patience and resignation that storm of rage which they could not avoid. Such a distinguished leader of the Christians could not long escape when such multitudes of the noble and the great of the heathen, as well as the Christians, were daily sacrificed to the savage cruelty or frantic jealousy of the blood-thirsty tyrant. He was apprehended, and along with Peter, it is said, was cast into prison. We learn from the last Epistle which he wrote to Timothy, that his companions almost all deserted him. Only St Luke remained, whose affection for St Paul was as undaunted at all forms of danger, as the fearless courage of the devoted soldier of the cross himself. It is evident that he did make an effort to justify himself and the cause which he preached, and that even the tyrant found some difficulty in procuring his condemnation. "At his first answer no one stood by him:" we are hence entitled to conclude that he was twice at least brought before the Roman tribunal. In the letter to Timothy already alluded to, he requests this devoted companion to bring a "cloak which he had left at Troas, and some parchments." It is not unreasonable to suppose that the one was his dress as a Roman citizen, and that the other contained the necessary documents to prove the fact of his being one. Chrysostom mentions that St Paul had converted one of the female favourites of the debauched prince, and thus incurred his particular resentment. Others mention the impostures of Simon Magus, who was at Rome, and the defeat and death of that heretic, as the immediate cause of the rage of Nero. But there is no occasion to search for any other reason than the indiscriminate slaughter which raged at the time, by which the savage persecutor foolishly thought to allay his own guilty fears, and divert the fury of the people away from himself.

Men of the highest rank, as well as the lowest, men of science and heathen philosophy, fell in that massacre, but, stoically as they had learned to look upon death under such a reign, none of them could welcome its approach with the triumphant confidence of Paul. He had fought the good fight, he had finished his race, he had kept the faith, he was now ready to be sacrificed, and he knew that a more righteous Judge than those at whose tribunal he had been condemned had laid up for him a crown of righteousness. That terrible persecution raged four years, till the universal abhorrence of his subjects drove the tyrant to inflict upon himself the death he deserved. But Paul had suffered two years before this. It is not known how long he remained in prison, nor whether his terrified friends again gathered round him. From the salutations which he sends to Timothy, he had friends who comforted him in his afflictions, but all the names are Roman except one. At last he was led out of the city to execution. As he went he is reported to have converted several of the soldiers who accompanied him, by his conversation and joyous confidence at the prospect of the end of his labours. He was beheaded, for, as a Roman citizen, he could not be crucified. Some miraculous circumstances are related of his death, which we forbear to transcribe, as they have all the appearance of being apocryphal. A splendid church was afterwards built upon the place where he was buried.

His own labours in the cause of that truth to the belief of which he was so wonderfully brought, are his best monument, and while the world stands, and faith remains among men, he will need no other panegyric than those treatises of Christian doctrine which he has left for the instruction and consolation, for the purifying and perfection of the Church. His was a power of intellect which could grasp all knowledge, a lofty imagination that could range over all the glory and sublimity of the universe, an untired and increasing ardour after excellence that

pressed onward to the bright mark—the prize of his high calling, a zeal for the eternal welfare of men, which made him undergo every hardship and cruelty at their hands, if, by possibility, he might gain them over to the belief of those doctrines whose truth he demonstrated so clearly, and inculcated by such persuasive motives. With all this high bearing of a triumphant conqueror, which made him carry the banner of the cross victoriously over the bounds of the civilized world, he had a deep humility which made him set himself on a level with the lowest believer in Christ, a sympathy which made him feel all the woes of others far more severely than he felt his own, a charity which was diffusive as the human race. Among all the benefactors of mankind, second to Him whose love to them is incomprehensible, and without any possible parallel in the universe, we hold Paul to be the noblest and most devoted.

PEKAH, the son of Remaliah, and one of the chief officers of Pekahiah, king of the Ten Tribes, was the successor of that monarch, whom he conspired against and murdered. He formed an alliance with Rezin, king of Syria, intending to make war upon Judah, to expel the family of David, and to place on the throne a tributary sovereign of another race. This design was probably formed to strengthen themselves against the Assyrians, who were becoming daily more formidable; but after Pekah and Rezin had gained a few advantages over Judah, the Assyrians, under their king Tiglath-Pileser, entered Syria, and subdued all Galilee and the country east of the Jordan, in the year B.C. 740. The principal inhabitants of Syria were sent to the river Kir, otherwise Cyrus, which unites with the Araxes, and discharges itself into the Caspian Sea. Great numbers of the Hebrews of the Ten Tribes were transferred to Assyria. After a reign of twenty years, during which he “did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, and departed not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin,” Pekah was mur-

dered by Hoshea, the last king of the Ten Tribes.

PEKAHIAH, the son and successor of Menahem, king of the Ten Tribes, was murdered by Pekah after a reign of two years, B.C. 759.

PETER, the Apostle, was a native of Bethsaida on the Lake of Galilee, and a fisher by trade. He was called at first Simon or Simeon, and his father's name was Jonah or John, probably of the same occupation with his sons. He had one brother called Andrew, who is supposed to have been the younger of the two. There is no certain means of knowing the age of Peter at the time when his name is first mentioned, but it is generally supposed that he was about ten years older than Jesus, or about forty years old when he first met him. Both Peter and Andrew were disciples of John the Baptist, though Peter, from the circumstance of being married, did not, perhaps, attend the preaching of John so frequently as his younger brother, who was not then married, so far as we may draw such a conclusion from the silence of the Evangelists on that point.

The character and preaching of John had raised great expectations among the people in regard to the Messiah, and when the great Deliverer was baptized by him, and pointed out as "the Lamb of God," Andrew, Simon's brother, and another disciple, followed Jesus, and from the intercourse and conversation they had with him received personal conviction that he was indeed the Messiah. Andrew immediately communicated the intelligence to Peter, whom he brought to Christ. He who knew the hearts of all men gave instant proof that he understood the character of the new inquirer. "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas," which in common Hebrew of the country signified a *stone*, the Greek of which is *Petros*, in our language Peter, by this indicating the fearless and determined character of Simon.

Jesus did not for some time call any to be his regular followers and disciples,

and these two brothers followed, as usual, their employment of fishers. It is probable, however, that they attended his preaching as often as they had opportunity. At last he was called in the following manner—Jesus walking by the shore of the lake entered the fishing boat of Peter, and taught the people who stood on the land. After finishing, he asked Peter to pull the boat into deeper water to a place pointed out, and cast his net. Peter and his brother had fished all night and caught nothing, but complied with such a request, and enclosed a draught which filled their own boat and that of James and John. Such power over the elements and the living creation struck Peter with astonishment and fear—he fell at the feet of Jesus, confessed that he was an unworthy sinner, and requested him to depart from him. Jesus encouraged them, told them to follow him, and he would make them "fishers of men." Thenceforth they left all, and became his constant followers and disciples. When Jesus came to reside chiefly at Capernaum, which he did after the rejection and unbelief of the people of Nazareth, he seems to have taken his abode generally in the house of Peter. By this time his father Jona seems to have been dead, and the brothers to have chosen this town as more convenient for their occupation than Bethsaida.

Such were the humble individuals whom Jesus chose to encounter the learned doctors of Israel, to confound all their wisdom, and refute all the dogmas of their ancient traditions, to enlighten the world in that wisdom which all the researches of its profoundest philosophy and most ardent study could never attain to—such were the conquerors and prime ministers whom he chose to go forth to subdue all the might of the kingdoms of this world, and bring all in subjection to the eternal kingdom which he had decreed from the beginning to establish among men, for the purpose of showing forth his character as the supreme Ruler and righteous Judge of all his creatures. He could have with equal ease gathered around

him the noble, and the mighty, and the learned of the land—could have entered on his work with the imposing array of dignity and worldly power, and carried a temporal conquest by the overmastering force of physical might, and could have enrolled among his followers the acute disputant and the eloquent and persuasive orator. These are the means by which alone the founders of sects of philosophy and religion, or the establishers of worldly dynasties, succeed in their object. But who that ever set himself to such a work deliberately selected such instruments as those chosen by Him who came to bring life and immortality clearly to light by his gospel? But the weakness and apparent unfitness of the instruments were in the end the most unquestionable and triumphant of all proofs that the doctrines could be no inventions of theirs—that the cause was the cause of God, and its success ensured by his presence and co-operation.

These simple followers continued some time disciples attending to the doctrines of Christ, before they were appointed to any higher charge. But in the second year of his ministry he selected twelve whom he called Apostles, that is, missionaries or ambassadors, with authority delegated to teach the same doctrines which he taught, and perform miracles similar to his, in proof of the truth which they published. Peter was the first of these, either on account of his age, or his devoted zeal, or undaunted boldness of conduct, and ready forwardness in expressing his love and attachment to his Master. Various exhibitions of this character we will see in his intercourse with Christ. In the storm which came down upon the disciples on the Lake of Galilee, when Jesus approached them walking on the water, and all the rest thought that it was an evil spirit announcing their destruction, and were seized with terror, Peter alone had the faith or courage to rely on the cheering assurance of Christ, and put it to the test, by stepping out of the ship and walking also on the stormy surface of the lake. The

strength of that confident faith indeed failed him, when he felt the heaving of the stormy billows, and he began to sink. His Master was there to support and save him, and the experiment ought to have taught him more diffidence in the strength of his own resolutions and his own faith, and have moderated the ardour of that prompt temper which was always more ready to urge him to speak and act than to deliberate. When many of the followers of Jesus were offended at his saying that if they would have an interest in him, they must eat his flesh and drink his blood—accepting the words probably in a literal sense—and ceased attending him, he asked his Apostles, “If they also would go away?” Peter replied, “To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.” Many of the disciples and occasional followers of Christ had expressed a temporary belief that he was the Son of God and Saviour of Israel, but there is reason to suppose that in many cases at least such a confession was accompanied with doubts and difficulties. The thorough conviction never left the mind of Peter. When the general public speculation in regard to the character of Christ was loud, and some took him for John the Baptist, or Elias, or Jeremiah, or some other of their ancient prophets, and when the other apostles hesitated to express any opinion of their own, Peter stepped forth, and made the noble confession for all, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Christ knowing the sincerity of this confession of faith, and the strength of that love which dictated it, pronounced Peter blessed in having such a truth revealed to him, and confirmed in his faith, which all the learning of the world could not teach, and to which the carnal expectations of his countrymen were altogether disinclined. It would seem that any previous professions of belief by any other were only formal and general, that this was in reality the first sincere and full announcement of belief in the true character of Christ. The name Peter, expressive of the bold and firm decision of that faith,

was renewed, and Jesus declared that he should be the foundation-stone on which he should build his church. He declared at the same time that he would give to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven—the power of binding and loosing upon earth, with the assurance that all which should be so performed by him, and with such faith, should be ratified in heaven. It is upon this grant that the popes found their claim to universal spiritual supremacy as the pretended direct successors of St Peter. They willingly forget that the same, or even ampler powers, were afterwards conferred upon the rest of the Twelve, and they have many other points more difficult of proof to establish, before they can show that the foundations of their power rest upon such a rock.

Peter, however, had the priority of age, he had the priority of a full confession of belief—he had certainly a superiority of ready zeal, and from deference to these, and to his bold decision, the rest seem willingly to have permitted him to be the speaker for them, the expresser of their sentiments, and now he was distinguished by the marked and apparently exclusive dignity conferred upon him by Jesus. If this high honour made Peter assume too much importance to himself, as seems likely, he soon received another check for his rashness. While he was looking forward to honours and dignities soon to be bestowed, Christ began to show them what was to be the nature of his kingdom—that he was to be rejected and persecuted, and put to death by the priests. Firm as the belief of Peter was in the divinity of Christ, such a consummation was destructive of all the hopes which he cherished, and he took his Master aside, and rebuked him as yielding to a spirit of despondency, asserting, with no little wonder at such a declaration, that such an event could never happen. This showed both overweening presumption and ignorance, and proved what worldly affections still dwelt in the breast of Peter, and he was rebuked with humbling severity, as if it had been dictated by the enemy of God and man:

“Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.”

We may suppose that the ardent boldness of the Apostle was humbled and checked for a time, but man's natural disposition will often show itself, notwithstanding repeated admonitions and reproofs. A short time after this, Peter, along with the sons of Zebedee, was taken up to a lofty mountain to witness the fullness of the glory of divinity which dwelt in Christ manifest itself in the feebleness of his human nature. During that scene of glorious transfiguration, when Moses, the giver of the Law, and Elijah, the most zealous upholder and reformer of it in evil times, conversed with Jesus upon the great consummation of the whole economy of God in the death of his Son, the ardent mind of the ambitious Peter was no doubt entranced to the highest degree of rapture. There he would have stopped till the admiration and reverential awe of his countrymen had brought them to hail Jesus with delight as their promised Messiah. He knew that the Rabbis taught that their Deliverer was to be manifested in great and outward glory to the people, and it would seem that the thought now entered his mind, that if he could detain these glorified saints and prophets of the days of old till they should assemble, all their doubts would be dissipated, and all their opposition be at an end. He, therefore, again proffered his own advice and his own services—“Lord, it is good for us to be here; if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias.” That high honour he never forgot—that scene of celestial glory—that proof of the divinity of his Master, never escaped from his mind, but he had yet much to learn what was the real nature of that glory as exhibited on earth.

Scarcely had they come down from that mount of celestial vision, when jealousies and rivalries in regard to pre-*cedence* in the *heavenly* kingdom, which

they expected soon to be erected on earth, occupied their minds. We have no reason to think that Peter was least ambitious or least active in asserting that pre-eminence, which he thought he had good cause to believe that Jesus had assigned to him. Such a spirit was not unlikely to provoke offences, and not the most ready to forgive. But Christ told him that he must forgive not only seven times, but seventy times seven—that unless he had the docility and gentleness of a little child, he should never enter into that kingdom, whose honours dazzled his mind so much. At Capernaum Christ gave him another practical illustration of the unworldly nature of his kingdom. Peter had been asked by the gatherers of the tax which was imposed upon every Jew above twenty, whether his Master paid this tribute. Peter replied in the affirmative, not knowing what other answer to give. When he came into the house to inform Jesus of the demand, he informed Peter that, as the Son and Heir of that Sovereign, for the support of whose earthly palace that tribute was imposed, He and his servants were exempt. But to avoid giving any ground of offence, he wrought a miracle to meet that demand, and the waters of the lake supplied the money to the hook of Peter. His claims of obedience came not in competition with those of earthly potentates. Still was the mind of Peter, as well as of the rest, set upon temporal rewards, and when Christ told them with what difficulty a rich man should enter into the kingdom of heaven, he and they were “exceedingly amazed.” Peter presumed to remind his Master that he had forsaken his nets and his trade to follow him, and wished to know what reward they were to look to. He was informed that if they followed Christ “in the regeneration, when he came in his kingdom, they should sit on twelve thrones judging Israel,” that in exchange for all which they left for his sake they should receive a hundred fold, and inherit eternal life.

Such proofs of faith and of devoted

attachment did Peter give, and with such returns of distinction and honour was he requited. Yet we shall see that he mistook the nature of Christ's undertaking and kingdom to the time when he was taken from them, and had a misplaced confidence in the strength of his own faith and resolution, till it led him into grievous sin. We pass over all the instructions and warnings which were common to him with the rest, and several other smaller incidents indicative of the character of this Apostle, and come to the mournful events which led to the consummation of that great sacrifice which was the chief object of Christ's coming into the world. Even at the last Supper, the dispute about the first place in the kingdom, which had so often raised heartburnings among them, again arose. By the most striking practical example which he had yet given, Christ taught them what kind of excellence most fitted them for such honours. He took off his upper garment, poured water into a bason, took a towel, and proceeded to wash the apostles' feet. Peter, who understood not the lesson of humility and condescension which the act was intended to inculcate, nor the symbolic meaning it was intended to convey, absolutely refused to accept of such menial service at the hands of his Divine Master. Jesus told him that, unless he were thus washed, he could have no part with him. The hasty resolution of the impetuous Peter was soon changed, and he wished not only his feet, but his hands and his head also, to undergo the same purification. Such frequent mistakes and errors from forwardness of zeal and rashness of resolution, and such frequent corrections, though gentle and kind, ought to have taught him distrust and caution. He little knew the cunning and power of the enemy that was watching him, and making himself secure of his destruction, as confidently as of that of the traitor whose heart he now occupied, and even of that of Jesus himself. He had repeatedly told them of the treachery of one of their number. He now pointed out that indi-

vidual. He told them also that all of them would be offended because of him that night, and repeated the words of the prophecy which foretold it. Peter declared, notwithstanding of this asseveration, that though all men should be offended because of him, he would never be offended. He was told of the enemy that lay in wait for him. Satan had desired to have him that he might sift him as wheat—"But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Peter still maintained his readiness to go with his Master both to prison and to death, and, in proof of the determined spirit with which he was animated, had furnished himself with a sword. The third time, Jesus more solemnly still assured him, that that very night he should thrice deny him, before the cock crew twice. Peter still averred, that though he should die with him, he would not deny him. In the garden of Gethsemane, whither he had taken Peter and the sons of Zebedee to watch with him, while he was in that agony of unspeakable suffering, in the intervals of that strong crying and supplication, he found the three favoured apostles asleep, and urged Peter especially to watch and pray, lest he should fall into temptation. Thus frequently forewarned and put upon his guard was Peter, and whatever reason he had to be assured of the infallible foreknowledge of Jesus, he seems to have been as confident as ever in the firmness of his own dauntless spirit, and the goodness of his own resolution to meet the approaching crisis. When the armed band, led by the traitor, came to apprehend their unresisting victim, that fiery Galilean courage did not forsake him. He did not fear to rush upon the serried and panoplied ranks of a thousand soldiers, so far making good his declaration of willingness to die with Christ. What were his thoughts or hopes of deliverance or rescue, we cannot know—that he intended and hoped to succeed we may conjecture from the words of Jesus, when he reproved the inconsiderate valour of

his follower, and healed the wound he had made—"Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" When Peter and the rest saw this willing surrender of their Master into the hands of his bitterest enemies, accomplished by the treachery of one of their number, they were confounded with amazement, and fled in terror. Peter, however, and John, as is supposed, followed at a distance when Jesus was led away, and gained admittance into the court of the high priest's palace, to witness the end. The truth must now have begun to dawn upon his mind, that all those repeated predictions which Christ had uttered regarding his rejection, and sufferings, and death, which he had once thought so unaccountable and impossible, were about to be fulfilled. In his amazement, and the devotion of his attachment, he thought not of himself, nor of the danger of apostacy which was hanging over him. In that crowd of eager and triumphant foes, he thought it would be easy for him to escape notice. When challenged as being one of the followers of Jesus, he pretended not to understand what was said—to be totally ignorant of the nature of the charge. He went out, and the cock crew; but the warning voice awakened him not to reflect and be on his guard. When challenged again, he denied with an oath, saying, that he knew not the man. When challenged a third time more sharply, as a Galilean whose speech betrayed him, as certainly a disciple of Christ, he averred loudly, with oaths and execrations, that he had no knowledge of him. While this profession of his rash apostacy was on his lips, the cock again crew, and "the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter." That gentle look of compassionate reproach made the conviction of his guilt flash upon his mind. Though ready to sink into the gulf of perdition, he stretched out no hand, he prayed for no aid of his Master, as he did when about to be whelmed in the angry

waves of the Lake of Galilee. But Jesus was there, and saved that over-ardent spirit from rushing upon self-destruction. He then at last saw his danger and felt his guilt, and in conscious shame, and remorse, and contrition, fled from that scene of the greatest crime that the earth had ever witnessed, and wept bitterly. We are informed that he never heard that warning voice afterwards, but the same bitter flood of tears ran down his cheeks.

These were gracious tears of true remorse and repentance; but after such a denial, the humbled Apostle could bear to look no longer upon that scene of unparalleled patience on the one hand, and of unexampled injustice and cruelty on the other. His confidence in his own courage and resolution was gone; and we may conclude that he hid himself in solitude, and spent the remainder of that day in weeping and prayer. He seems to have lodged in the house of John, and from him he would receive an account of the closing scene of his Lord's sufferings. On the morning of the resurrection, when the angels announced to the women that Jesus was risen from the grave, they gave a special message to Peter. He was the first to hurry away to the tomb to ascertain the truth; and to him of all the apostles Christ first appeared, to pour the balm of consolation into his wounded heart, and prevent him from falling into the depths of despair. This was an intimation from his Master that he was not rejected from being an apostle; but several interviews passed between Jesus and the disciples, before Peter was fully restored to that office which he had virtually renounced. At last, on the shores of the Lake of Galilee, where he had been first called, and while similarly engaged, Christ again conferred upon him the office of an apostle and pastor in his church. Another miraculous draught of fishes, at the word of Christ, brought back old associations and feelings; and Peter, not waiting till they should be drawn to land, cast himself into the water, and hastened to show his affec-

tion to Jesus. Peter had always been foremost in showing his zeal and attachment above the rest; and Jesus now asked him, whether he still entertained greater love to him than they? The humbled Apostle could only appeal to the knowledge of Him who knew the hearts of all, as to the sincerity of his love. Thrice had that unworthy denial been repeated—unworthily of the name which his Master had bestowed upon him, and of his high standing in the number of the chosen disciples—and thrice was the question repeated, not by the name of Peter, to which by his conduct his Lord showed him he had lost the title, but by the name he bore before he became an Apostle—"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" The grieved and repentant Peter thrice professed his love, and appealed to his Master, who knew his sincerity, and so often was the charge to feed his lambs and his sheep renewed and confirmed by the compassionate Saviour. Thus encouraged and restored, he was told that in his old age he should follow his Master to martyrdom and to glory. In his youth he had thought that all should submit to his will; he had received many a lesson of the dangers into which that wilful impetuosity led him, but at last he should glorify Jesus at the more tyrannical will and command of others. The last special command to Peter was to "follow Christ," and to allow his mind to be filled and distracted with no other concern.

He again saw Jesus in Jerusalem, and was present when he ascended from the Mount of Olives into the glory of heaven. The apostles had been commanded to wait in Jerusalem till the Holy Spirit should be given, before they went forth to preach the Gospel. We learn from Luke that the whole number of the assembled disciples amounted to no more than a hundred and twenty. When these were collected together to deliberate on their future proceedings, Peter seems to have been president of the meeting. He rose to suggest that another should be chosen in the room of the traitor, accord-

ing to the prophetic injunction of the Psalm, which foretold his treachery and his fall. We learn, from his speech on the occasion, what were the necessary qualifications of an external nature to constitute an apostle; he must be one who had followed Jesus as a disciple, and a witness of his deeds from the time of John the Baptist till after the resurrection. But we find Peter assuming no dictatorial authority over the rest. He referred the matter to them, and with prayer they referred the decision to God, and Matthias was chosen.

The day of Pentecost arrived, and the promise of Christ was fulfilled. They were all together, and the Spirit descended like a mighty wind, and rested upon the head of each of them in the form of cloven tongues of fire. In the atheistic combination at Babel, God descended and filled the mouths of the godless politicians with such a multiplicity of tongues that the impious council ended in fierce division and wide separation; but now, when all tribes and tongues of the earth were to be again brought into one mind and one faith, the preachers of the one eternal truth were qualified to go forth and proclaim the only infallible counsel of the true God over all the earth, in all the languages which dissension and difference of principle in the lapse of ages had produced. The immediate impulse of this inspired gift from on high seems to have been to urge forth those upon whom it descended to proclaim to the congregated multitudes "the wonderful works of God." By His peculiar Providence the chosen people were at that time scattered over every nation in the civilized world. From the eternal snows of Parthia to the scorching heats of the torrid zone—from the unknown regions of the rising sun to the farthest bounds of the west—devout Jews, whose hopes were now erected in anxious expectation of their promised Deliverer, repaired to worship at Jerusalem. When these thousands from all climes and tongues of the earth heard these rude and unlettered Galileans proclaiming, with such power

and confidence, and clearness of appeal to ancient prophecies, and to facts which accomplished these, the doctrine that the promised Messiah was come, and had finished the great work of the redemption of Israel, we cannot wonder that they were amazed and confounded. Sincere inquirers and devout believers might well ask, "What meaneth this?" And those who are acquainted with the grossly degenerated and infidel character of the native Jews of that day will not wonder that they scoffingly answered, "These men are full of new wine." We know not whether such an answer and solution of the supercilious scribes might have satisfied the devout Jews of the provinces and distant nations, but it called forth Peter, now no longer under any selfish fear, or ashamed of the consequences of acknowledging his belief in his crucified Saviour, and declaring that he was the only hope of Israel. He stood forth, surrounded by the rest of the apostles, and maintained that this miraculous gift of tongues and spiritual knowledge was the fulfilment of ancient prophecy; that the last days were come when signs in heaven and wonders on earth had already announced that the great and terrible visitation of the Lord was present. He then appealed to the miraculous works of Jesus of Nazareth, which he had done in the sight of them all. They had taken and crucified him unjustly and wickedly, but he showed how this had been foretold and decreed in the eternal counsels of God. He proved that that death and resurrection were events which were predicted by David, and, instead of being evidence against the Messiahship of Jesus, were the first of all proofs that their Lord and Christ had indeed finished his work, and ascended to the throne of his glory. He declared that all with him were witnesses of this resurrection, and that these manifestations of the Holy Spirit, of which they might themselves judge, were the gifts of Him who had assumed his power in the heavens, and would exercise it on earth till he had brought all his enemies under his foot-

stool, and called upon all to acknowledge him as both Lord and Christ. 'Such a convincing appeal from such an individual, to their knowledge and hopes and powers of reasoning, had an instantaneous effect. Wonder and fear spread over that vast assemblage of many nations, and they exclaimed, "What shall we do?" The direct and only answer which could be given was, "To repent and believe, and be baptized in the name of Christ," who had wrought out this great salvation for them. We are told by Luke that he proved these truths at great length, and exhorted the people to save themselves from the destruction impending over that untoward generation. The Apostle's ardent zeal and faithful testimony were crowned with abundant success. Three thousand joyfully received the truth, were baptized that same day, and joined the company of the disciples.

The believers in Christ now assumed the form of a regular church. They met stately, and like the small body of the disciples while Jesus was on earth, they had all things in common. They wrought many miracles, and by their brotherly harmony and piety of life were highly esteemed by the people, many of whom daily joined them. Yet they paid reverence to the institutions of Moses, and seem to have entertained no thought that these were to be abrogated and superseded by the simpler and more spiritual worship of the gospel. They worshipped daily in the Temple, complying, we presume, with all the ritual ordinances of the Levitical economy. Old things were passing rapidly away, but they had still spiritual significance, and not less so when they were combined in the mind of the worshipper with the present and spiritual realities of the worship of Jesus Christ. They had no mysteries which they wished to be kept secret from the people, and, like Jesus, they worshipped and taught openly in the Temple. Shortly after this public manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit, Peter and John went to the Temple at the hour of evening prayer and sacrifice. As they were entering, a beggar

who lay at the Beautiful gate, and who had been lame from infancy, asked alms of them. They, like their Master, had no money to give, but they had that power which could bestow upon such an individual a gift which all the riches of this world cannot purchase. Peter called the attention of the expectant mendicant, and in the name of Jesus commanded the lame man to rise up and walk. He must have heard of that name, and of the many miracles which had been wrought by Jesus, and probably had faith, that now the word of power pronounced by Peter would restore him to strength. The Apostle took him by the hand, and immediately the elasticity of youthful vigour was given to those helpless limbs. He who had till now been indebted to the aid of others to carry him as an object of compassion, leaped and walked in the exuberance of his delight, and entered the Temple with his wonder-working benefactors to praise God for this miraculous cure wrought upon him.

Such a deed, so publicly done in the name of the crucified Jesus, and by one of his followers, could not fail to excite great astonishment. Priest and people no doubt thought that all pretences to divine authority would have been relinquished upon the death of Jesus of Nazareth. This was too striking a proof to the contrary to be overlooked and passed by in silence or contempt. Peter observing the mute and gazing wonder with which they were contemplated, again testified loudly that it was through no power or holiness of their own that this miracle had been wrought—that it was the power of that same Jesus whom they had rejected, in their ignorance, whom their rulers had ignominiously put to death, but who was the Saviour promised to all the ancient patriarchs. God had raised him from the dead, and made him Prince of life, and had commissioned them as his apostles and ambassadors to call all to repentance—that to them the promises of the ancient covenant belonged, and if they turned from their iniquity and believed, they should escape the de-

struction which was threatened of old, and obtain all the blessings which God had ever promised. John also addressed the multitude to the same effect, and such reasoning, sanctioned by the display of such heavenly power, had a mighty influence on their minds. Five thousand were convinced of the truth of the apostles' doctrine, and became converts.

Such events could not escape the jealous eye of the priests. The Sadducees also were enraged, as men who hoped and wished for no existence beyond this life, and had good reason to dread a future retribution, that the doctrine of the resurrection through Jesus should be reached by such men. They procured an armed force as the *best* means, the only means possessed by them, to answer such arguments, and seizing upon the two apostles, committed them to prison. Next day a full and solemn assembly was summoned, and Peter and John brought before them to be examined. They well knew the remorseless character of those judges—they remembered well the scene of tyrannical injustice which both had lately witnessed there, and had no reason to expect more impartiality at their hands than Jesus had done. Yet though rude, and unlettered, and poor, and by nature inclined to be overawed by the nobility and learning and public sanctity of that august assemblage, no doubt of the sacredness of their cause could enter their minds, nor fear take possession of their hearts, though they saw the tearing scourge and the cruel torments of the cross before them. The poor Galilean fisherman with honest boldness sets himself forth as the dauntless accuser and condemner of his judges—tells them that they had rejected and crucified their Messiah—that that risen Saviour was now the chief corner-stone of the completed edifice of God's economy for the salvation of the world—that no other name under heaven could be found by which men could be saved. Confidently might the Apostle point to the man who stood beside him as a living and unanswerable witness of all that he de-

clared. Upright judges, and sincere inquirers, and men of true faith, could not have hesitated a moment what judgment they ought to have formed—what conduct they ought to have pursued in these circumstances. But the rulers of the Jews were none of these, and they acted like men doomed to infatuated blindness.

They excluded the apostles from their deliberation, and argued in a way which we should have supposed no sane reason would have sanctioned. They did not pretend to deny the greatness of the miracle, and they found no better expedient than to threaten the apostles to prevent them from doing any more, and to command them to speak no more in the name of Christ. Never did prisoner return a severer or more deserved reproof to unrighteous judges than the apostles did—"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Eagerly would they have taken more effectual means to silence the preaching of these doctrines, but durst not venture for fear of the people, and with additional threats unwillingly let them depart from their cruel hands.

Well might the believers in Christ have expected a different and fatal termination to that pretended trial, and they and the liberated apostles had good reason to thank God with grateful hearts that he had delivered them from the rage of that godless combination which had cut off their Master, and to pray that He would give them boldness to preach his truth, and would confirm it with such miracles as he had done. They had immediate proof that this prayer was heard, and that the Almighty arm was around them. The place where they were was shaken, and they were again all filled with the Holy Ghost to speak the word with boldness. No wonder that the numbers of believers increased in such circumstances, and that, when the determination of their implacable enemies was so fell to destroy them, they should be the more closely united in brotherly harmony. But amid such

powerful enemies they saw that they must live as pilgrims and strangers. All who had possessions sold them, and brought the price into one common stock for the support of all. We have every reason to believe that the great majority of the disciples were of the poorer classes, and that profession of the name of Christ brought upon them the sentence of excommunication, and put an end to all friendly intercourse with the more wealthy of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. This community of goods was not constrained by any decree of the apostles, but seems to have been the effect of the diffusive principle of charity inspired by the gospel. Being so universal, it was essential that no avaricious deception should be practised—that none should obtain the applause of generosity, while it was only crafty ostentation, with a spirit of gross avarice at the bottom. Ananias tried to practise a hypocritical deception of this kind. He sold his property, laid part of the price before the apostles, “keeping back” the rest. The rule and practice being that all should share and be supported alike out of the common treasury, he thought that he had secured to himself the credit of liberality, while he could enjoy superior comforts. This was an obvious attempt to impose upon the apostles, and to trifle with the omniscience of God. Peter charged him with his hypocrisy, as being the conduct of one who in act lied to the Holy Ghost. The punishment was instantaneous—he fell down and expired at the apostles’ feet. Sapphira, his wife, agreed in the deception, and was punished in the same way. These were terrible examples, but it was necessary that dissimulation should be discountenanced, and that none should join the Christian church from the love of gain. Awe fell upon their minds when they beheld the apostles acquainted with the secrets of men’s hearts, and possessed of a power of condign punishment. We cannot wonder that none but sincere converts joined them. But this was an example of rare severity. They exer-

cised their miraculous gifts more in healing all diseases, relieving all distress, and expelling unclean spirits. Such was the number and wonderful nature of these, that multitudes were brought and laid on the streets, and the shadow of Peter, as he passed along, was thought by them sufficient to heal them. The expression of Luke leaves us in doubt whether this wonderful power was really bestowed upon the Apostle, or whether it was the superstitious belief of the people, who, from what they saw done at his word, expected that health would be given to all over whom his shadow passed.

Such deeds could not be performed, and such doctrines taught, without giving deadly offence to the high priest Ananias and the rest of the rulers. They determined once for all to put an end to this spreading defection, and imprisoned the whole of the apostles. But He who came to open the prison doors to those who were the captives of ignorance and sin, struck off their chains, removed their bars, and led them through the armed guards unseen and unharmed, and told them to go and preach boldly in his name. The high priest and the council might well be astonished when they learned that all their precautions were vain, that all their force was of no avail. They had reason “to doubt whereunto this would grow,” and ought to have earnestly examined the evidence of the doctrines. They did none of this, but sent their soldiers to bring the apostles again before them, but without violence, for the Sadducean party, many of whom were now in power, were unpopular among the Jews. The accusation is very singular from such a quarter—“Behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.” They had shed that innocent blood, and they had taken the guilt of it upon their own heads, and were aggravating that guilt by their whole conduct. Peter told them this fearlessly, and again declared that they would not refrain from obeying the commands of God from dread of them—that

their only chance of deliverance and forgiveness was to repent and believe in him whom they had hanged on the cross, and who was now exalted as a Prince and Saviour. They were astonished, but more enraged at such threats and advice from an individual of Peter's character, and would have put the whole instantly to death. Gamaliel, who is without any good reason supposed to have been secretly a Christian, begged the high priest to reflect upon his resolution, and showed by several examples that imposture soon detected itself, and brought ruin upon those who were led astray by it. He argued, that if this new doctrine, and the *works* by which it was accompanied, were of men, it would have the same fate, and they need not therefore be alarmed; but that if it were the doing of God, they could not fight against Him, nor defeat His counsel. They assented to a proposition, the reasonableness of which they could not controvert; but instead of acting upon it, they beat the apostles, and again commanded them not to preach in the name of Jesus. Peter and the rest had refused to obey such a command before, and the perverse obstinacy of unreasonable men only increased their zeal—they spread themselves over the whole city, "and ceased not in the Temple, and in every house, to teach and to preach Jesus Christ."

We have no farther particular account of Peter till after the dispersion which was made of the disciples on the persecution succeeding the martyrdom of Stephen. Philip, the Deacon, had preached the Gospel with great success in Samaria. Even Simon, the sorcerer, was convinced and baptized, being astonished at the miracles wrought by the Evangelist, so very different from the juggleries by which he had deceived the people. Peter and John were sent down to perfect the work by bestowing the spiritual gifts of the Holy Ghost, which the apostles alone could do. These gifts were not bestowed upon all indiscriminately, but only on such as the Holy Spirit pointed out as fit pastors and teachers in the new churches.

Such powers as those possessed and bestowed by the apostles excited still more strongly the selfish and ambitious mind of Simon. He considered these miraculous powers as analogous to his own, but far beyond any knowledge or craft that he enjoyed. He offered the apostles money if they would impart to him this wonderful secret. It was evident, therefore, that whatever was the nature of the *belief* he had professed, it was not the right *faith* in the Son of God. Peter rebuked him sternly as a worshipper of mammon, whose heart was corrupt, who could have no part in such a work, and called upon him to repent of his wickedness, and pray for forgiveness. This first simoniacal trafficker in holy things seems to have been a little alarmed at the severe reproof of the apostles, and requested them to pray for him, that none of those evils should befall him. That profession of regret was not genuine, and this imposter afterwards became the founder of a heretical party which introduced grievous errors into the Church. After accomplishing the work upon which they had been sent, and preaching in many Samaritan villages, Peter and John returned to Jerusalem.

It is likely that Peter and the other apostles made similar visits as that mentioned to various places, as their presence was required. We have no account of him for three or four years after this, and Baronius, along with other Popish writers, pretend, contrary to all probability, that he visited Antioch, and planted a church there, and afterwards visited all the Gentile churches. It is certain that of these last there was yet none, nor for many years afterwards, beyond Judea. When Paul came to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, Peter was still there. Some time, probably years, after this, we find them travelling through Judea, Galilee, and Samaria. In all these countries there were now many churches, and the Apostle did not visit them without giving them instructions and imparting spiritual gifts. At Lydda, a town near the sea-coast he restored Æneas to

health, who had been laid on his bed with palsy for eight years. This miracle excited the attention of the people to listen to his doctrines, and many were converted. While he stayed here messengers came from Joppa, begging him to come thither and console the believers, who were in deep distress at the death of Tabitha. She was a woman of extensive charity and beneficence, and the disciples might perhaps hope that the same power which had banished a cureless palsy would be exerted on the present occasion. Peter obeyed the call, and praying to him who holds the keys of life and of death, was the means of recalling the vanished spirit to its clay tabernacle, and restored her alive to her astonished friends. Such miracles accompanying the preaching of the Word produced belief in many, and the Apostle resided a considerable time in Joppa, which, as being the ancient sea-port of Jerusalem, was large and populous.

But this place is more remarkable as being the scene in which it was revealed to Peter in a vision, that the gate of mercy and of acceptance was now to be opened to the Gentiles. While he was praying, he fell into an ecstatic trance. The heavens opened, and a large sheet, bound by the corners, descended to the earth, out of which came every kind of creature, clean and unclean; and he was commanded to rise and kill, and satisfy his hunger. Peter, though pressed with great want, refused to defile himself by eating forbidden food, or such as had been polluted by the contact of unclean reptiles. He was told to call nothing unclean which God had cleansed. This symbolic vision of the breaking down of the partition wall which separated Jews and Gentiles was thrice repeated. While Peter was musing on the meaning and purpose of this, those were at hand who explained it. Cornelius, a Roman officer of Caesarea, and a man of extensive charity and sincere piety, had been desired by an angel, who appeared to him, to send for Peter, who would instruct him in the doctrines of the

truth. The messengers of Cornelius were now at the door, and Peter was commanded by the Spirit to accompany them without doubt or fear. The whole circumstances of this most important era in the history of the diffusion of the precepts of the Gospel are narrated with very great minuteness. From ancient times Christ had been foretold as a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as to be the glory of his own peculiar people of Israel: he had told the apostles repeatedly that they were to preach his Gospel to all nations. But eleven or twelve years had now elapsed since that charge, and they had not yet gone to the Gentiles, and seem not to have known in what manner this duty was to be accomplished. It is evident that all of them still retained whatever in them may be called their national prejudices against having any intercourse with the heathen. Peter, who had first proclaimed with power the resurrection of his Saviour to the Jews, was now also chosen to open the gate of admission to the Gentiles. But though he was certain of the divine commission and command, he took every step with scrupulous caution, as one who knew that he would be called to give an account of his proceedings to his brother apostles. Cornelius was ready to receive him, and had invited many of his friends also to hear this messenger of heaven. Peter, after particularly inquiring into the reasons that led him to send such a message, and finding these minutely to agree with the revelation which had been made to himself, laid before them the character and work, and the principles of the faith of Jesus Christ. While he preached forgiveness of sins through belief in his name, the Holy Ghost fell upon the Gentile hearers, inspiring them with the same heavenly gifts which had been given to the disciples on the day of Pentecost. This was matter of astonishment to the Jewish converts, but it was the explanation and consummation of the vision; and the Apostle felt it to be his duty to baptize them in the name of Christ. After this he seems to have

stopped some time to confirm these converts, and instruct them more perfectly in the precepts of the Gospel.

The report of the Apostle's proceedings caused no little wonder and censure at Jerusalem. Even the rest of the apostles seem to have doubted the propriety of his conduct, if they did not condemn it altogether. The thorough hatred and contempt of the Jews for all other nations is well known. They considered them as a race who ought to be only slaves to the seed of Abraham, for whom alone they believed the world to be made. When Peter, therefore, returned to Jerusalem, there was an angry attack made upon him for having degraded and polluted himself, by eating bread with the uncircumcised heathen. To have reasoned against such an unreasonable prejudice was vain. The Apostle, therefore, related the whole circumstances from beginning to end, proving that the power of Jehovah was there as manifestly as it was when the Holy Spirit was poured out upon them, and that he was only an instrument in the hand of God. Such facts and evidence put an end to all cavil, and like men whose minds were opened to a new truth, and their heart to a new affection, they rejoiced that God had given to the Gentiles repentance unto life. After this event we have no account of Peter for at least two years. Some of the Romish writers have stated that during the interval he visited Antioch, planted a church there, and extended his labours into Asia. But there is not the slightest foundation for such a supposition, but rather the contrary, since Luke particularly mentions the visit of Barnabas to that city—intimating, pretty clearly, that he was the first of the apostolical men who established a church there. We have reason to believe that Peter resided principally at Jerusalem, though he may have occasionally visited the churches in the provinces during these years.

Some time after this, Agrippa, who had been made king of Judea, attempted to gain popularity by cutting off the Chris-

tians. He had put James the son of Zebedee to death, with the approbation of the priesthood, and Peter being a still more distinguished leader of the dreaded Nazarenes, he imprisoned him with the intention of gratifying his new subjects with his execution after the Pass-over. The anticipated loss of such an Apostle was an object of deepest grief to the disciples, and earnest and continued prayer was made by the whole Church for his deliverance. Those fervent prayers were heard, and while Peter slept calmly in his gloomy dungeon chained to two soldiers, and the prison doors strongly guarded by sixteen others, the angel of God appeared to him, wakened him from his sleep—his chains fell off—he was commanded to dress himself and follow. He walked untouched through the watchful guards of the tyrant, and the ponderous doors of the dungeon opened of their own accord. While this scene was passing it seemed to Peter the delusion of a dream, and it was only when the angel left him in the nocturnal solitude of the slumbering city that he was aware of the reality of the miraculous deliverance. He hurried first to the house of Mary, where his anxious friends were praying for him, and so despairing was their grief at what seemed to them the certainty of his being cut off, as James had been, that it was only on the strongest evidence they would believe that it was not his spirit. Having given them full assurance of his safety, he thought it his duty to shun the disappointed rage of Agrippa and the Jews by retiring from the city. When the morning was come, it is easy to suppose what astonishment there was among the guards when they discovered that Peter was gone. The king ordered strict search to be made for him, and after examining the soldiers, caused them to be put to death, as if they had been guilty of conspiring at the escape of their prisoner. Such means did the rulers of the Jews take to extinguish the truth, and prevent its propagation. Had they calmly considered the circumstances, they would have seen that they were vainly fighting

against God. This Agrippa soon learned, and those who had so eagerly abetted him might have been convinced of it, when at Cæsarea, in the height of his glory, he was struck down by the same loathsome disease which had arrested the cruelty of his grandfather.

After the death of Agrippa, Judea was again placed under Roman governors, and till the total overthrow of the Jewish polity was not possessed in its extent by any of the descendants of Herod. Under those heathen rulers, rapacious and tyrannical as most of them were, the Jews were restrained from any outrageous acts of cruelty against the Christians, at least under the form of law. We have no account of the labours of Peter during an interval of about six years, when we find him about A.D. 50 or 51 at the great apostolic synod at Jerusalem, which was called to decide how far the rites of the Jewish law were binding on Gentile converts. During this period the Popish writers suppose that Peter visited Rome in the reign of Claudius, but without the slightest evidence. In his speech upon the subject he states that "a good while ago God had chosen him to make known the word of the gospel to the Gentiles," but he there evidently alludes to the conversion of Cornelius alone. Paul and Barnabas second the argument of Peter, as men who had had much more extensive experience and observation of the effect of preaching the gospel among the Gentiles. Had Peter in reality been at Rome, and acted as apostolical bishop of that city for ten or twelve years previous to this council, there could not have been any occasion for starting such a dispute. The whole scope of the evangelical narrative leads us to the conclusion, that a Gentile church of converts from idolatrous heathenism was then only beginning to be formed. It is barely possible that Peter might have been at Rome in the reign of Claudius, but if he were, it could only be as a teacher for a very short time of converted Jews. But even of this we have no hint in the Evangelical history, much less that he

was *twenty-five* years apostolical bishop of Rome, which Baronius attempts to prove, though he confesses it "a history hard to be understood, a stone of offence, a rock of scandal, a rugged place, which St Augustine himself could not pass over without stumbling."

Our space will not allow us to refute all the arguments upon which the Roman Catholic writers attempt to rest the claim they advance for the primacy of Peter among the apostles, and his title to be the first bishop at Rome. The strain of the narrative will do this more effectually to all candid minds. Shortly after this solemn decree of the apostolic council, we learn from Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, when writing on this very subject of Christian freedom from the yoke of ceremonial bondage, that Peter came down to visit the flourishing church at Antioch. In accordance with his own speech at the council, and with the spirit of the decree, he held intercourse in all brotherly harmony and spiritual communion with the Gentile converts. The extension of Christ's kingdom no doubt gave him joy, and as he had done at Cæsarea with the converts of the family of Cornelius, so he did here—acted as if there were no distinction any longer to be kept up in any thing between the converts of the circumcision and those of the uncircumcision. When, however, other disciples came down from Jerusalem, who gave a more narrow interpretation to the apostolical decretals, as if they permitted the Gentiles to observe their own practices in things morally indifferent, but still kept up the wall of separation between them and the believing descendants of Abraham, and allowed these to consider the Gentiles as an inferior and unclean race of men, Peter temporised and dissembled, and changed his conduct. He withdrew from his former friendly intercourse with the Gentiles, and kept himself separate, as if he would thence have caught pollution and incurred sin. Such an example had a very pernicious effect; the other Jewish believers imitated his conduct, so that even Barnabas, who

had first established the church in due form in that city, "was carried away with their dissimulation." Paul, who saw the dangerous consequences certain to arise out of the upholding of such abrogated distinctions, in the jealousies and irritation which would arise in the Gentile converts, boldly, before all, rebuked his elder brother in the apostleship for hypocrisy and double-dealing. Peter knew well that by obedience to the ceremonial rites of the law no one could be justified—he now allowed himself the liberty of living with the Gentiles as one perfectly emancipated from these temporary ordinances, and yet he acted in such a way as was calculated to make the Gentiles believe that they could not be on an equality of privilege with the Jewish converts, unless they came under the rites of the Law of Moses. With such arguments as these did the great Apostle of the Gentiles withstand to the face the equally great Apostle of the circumcision; and certainly the latter was to be blamed. We cannot agree with Jerome that this censure was only a pretence on the part of Paul, for the purpose of allaying the irritation of mind which would naturally arise among the Gentiles, much less can we agree with the hostile remark of Porphyry, that it was error and falsehood on the part of Peter, and rudeness and incivility on that of Paul, proving the whole doctrine a system of imposture, when these two princes of the Apostles thus quarrelled with each other. We need scarcely mention the supposition of other early writers, that there were two of the name of Cephas, and that this dissembler was not the son of Jonas. There can be no doubt that it was the Apostle, and that he was led into error from the weak fear of giving offence to his Jewish brethren. We have much better reason to suppose that he saw the error of his conduct when thus sincerely pointed out, and that he confessed and amended his fault.

It is unfortunate for the argument of the sticklers of the pontifical primacy of the bishop of Rome as being derived from the Apostle Peter, that the last

mention of him in the history of the Acts should leave him with the stigma of timid and ill-judged prevarication on his conduct. Of his farther labours we have only the very contradictory accounts of the ancient historians and other ecclesiastical writers to guide us, which it is altogether impossible to reconcile. That he did not go to Rome immediately after being in Antioch, or at least that he did not stop any time there, we have reason to conclude, because he is not mentioned, or any salutation addressed to him in St Paul's Epistle to the church there, which was written several years after this. Again, during his first imprisonment at Rome for two years, in which he wrote four Epistles, there is no mention of Peter, which we can scarcely conceive would have been omitted, had he been actually there at the time. We cannot, therefore, give any credit to the Popish legend that Peter was twenty-five years bishop of Rome, or even that he was bishop of the church there at all. The apostolate, as being derived immediately from Christ, was a higher office in the church than episcopacy, and Peter's field was wide as the dispersion of the Jews. Yet when some of these old historians state that he was seven years besides bishop of Antioch, that he preached also the gospel in Babylon, and even in Britain, according to Metaphrastes, we are compelled, in spite of the highest admiration we may entertain of Peter's zeal and activity, to say that it is impossible to reconcile these accounts. We may readily believe that during some of those intervals alluded to, he *may* have travelled beyond the bounds of Palestine, and visited his countrymen "scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia (proconsular), and Bithynia," to whom his first Epistle is addressed. He is also said to have preached the gospel in Byzantium, and founded a church in that city, though this could not have been so early as the forty-fourth year of Christ. If he did visit Rome in the reign of Claudius, and departed when that capricious and cruel emperor issued the decree

of expulsion against all Jews, he and his disciples left Italy at the same time. It is more probable, however, and seems more consistent with the narrative of Luke, that the first time that he left the country of his fathers was when he came to Antioch. At this time he would be considerably above sixty years of age, and we cannot suppose that he would travel then from the banks of the Euphrates to the utmost bounds of the west. He indeed dates his first Epistle from Babylon, but though such a title is the reverse of complimentary to that city, which claims him as the fountain-head of her sacerdotal primacy, even the Popish writers agree in supposing that Rome is meant. Instead, therefore, of weaving a half-probable and unauthenticated narrative out of contradictory, and many of them evidently fabricated materials, we shall suppose that after preaching in Asia and various parts of Europe, perhaps also on the coast of Africa, he came to Rome, as the universal voice of antiquity agrees, towards the latter part of the reign of Nero. From his first Epistle we learn that Mark was with him, and Clement of Alexandria also mentions that his wife was there. Here he again encountered Simon, the Samaritan magician, who is reported by Justin the Martyr, Irenæus, and other early writers, to have obtained great celebrity as a sorcerer at Rome, and even to have been treated as a divine person by Nero. The stories related by these authors of his pretending to raise the dead, and attempting to fly to heaven by the help of two devils, and of his being precipitated by the prayer of Peter and Paul, have too much the character of the fabulous legends of a later age to be credited in every particular. But we may believe that his imprudent sorceries were exposed by Peter, and the man proved to be a lying and avaricious imposter. This and the conversion of several of the female favourites of the grossly licentious court of Nero is reported to have been the cause of his deadly hatred of the apostles. Peter and Paul were cast into prison,

where they remained a considerable time. It is not certain whether he wrote his first Epistle before his imprisonment or when in confinement. It appears, however, that it was written in prospect of the "judgments and fiery trials" which were approaching, and were to begin "at the house of God." He comforts them under that prospect from the example of Christ, and the inheritance of glory that was reserved for them, and exhorts them to submit to all constituted authorities in turbulent times, when the insurrection of the Jews was about to bring destruction upon them. The second Epistle, which has no particular address, purports to be written shortly before his death, the speedy approach of which "Christ Jesus had showed him." He assures his converts of the certainty of all that they had been taught by the apostles, alluding expressly to the Epistles of Paul, whom he calls his "beloved brother." He warns them at great length against false teachers, whose character and doctrines he describes particularly, and whose certain destruction he foretels. He concludes by an awfully sublime description of the dissolution of all things, equal in magnificence to any thing ever written, and urges them to prepare for that scene of judgment, and final and full retribution to both righteous and wicked.

We know not how long the Apostle was kept in prison, but while the Christians looked with bitter grief upon his expected death, they urged him to save himself by escaping the unjust sentence of the tyrant. He at last yielded to their strong importunity, and having taken farewell of his friends, escaped over the prison wall, and was leaving the city. When he was now past all danger, he met Jesus entering the gate, and asked him whither he was going. Christ replied that "he was come to Rome to be crucified a second time." Peter took this as a reproof of his own fear, a condemnation of the conduct which he was pursuing. He therefore immediately returned to the prison, and surrendered himself to the jailor. This may have passed in vision,

as Milner supposes, and have been intended as an encouragement of the aged warrior of the cross to testify by that death which had been predicted, to the truth of those doctrines which he had so long and faithfully preached. He was at last led forth to execution on the Vatican Mount. Remembering his own cowardly denial of Jesus in the prospect of a similar death, he requested as a favour that he should be crucified with his head downwards, as a more degrading kind of death than that of his Master. If such a request was indeed made, we have no doubt that it would be granted, but it seems rather a conceit, and if such a thought had entered the Apostle's mind, it is more likely that he would have chosen some of those more horribly ingenious modes of torture which Nero invented during that bloody persecution for the amusement of the Roman multitude. His martyrdom is generally supposed by the ecclesiastical writers to have happened at the same time with that of Paul, though some state that it was a year, and others several years, before that event. He must have been nearly eighty years of age at the time. He was buried on the Vatican Mount, where he suffered, and Constantine erected a church over his grave. This was afterwards splendidly adorned and enriched by successive emperors and pontiffs, and on the same hill is now the palace of his self-constituted and ambitious successor. Here the Romanists pretend that the chair which was used by the Apostle is still preserved. He is reported by Clemens of Alexandria to have had children, but no authentic account of their history is handed down. The two Epistles are the only genuine writings of Peter which have been preserved. A great number of apocryphal books have, however, been ascribed to him, and were early circulated under the pretended sanction of his name. St Mark's Gospel, indeed, was often called that of St Peter, upon the general belief that it was written under his inspection, or received his sanction. Another Gospel, purporting to be written by him, is also

mentioned, but it was speedily rejected as spurious. The books of his Acts and Preachings, and Apocalypse and Judgment, were early attempted by heretics to be palmed upon the church, but have all been condemned as gross forgeries.

In this account of the life and labours of Peter, his character is conspicuous. Naturally possessed of an open and ardent disposition, he was forward on all occasions to speak and to act. His impetuosity occasionally led him into rashness, and exposed him to danger, but his courage, after he was confirmed in the inspired knowledge and faith of his risen Lord, braved all danger, and triumphed over all opposition. Though rude and unlearned, he feared not to accuse to their face the noblest and most learned of the rulers and priests of Judea of murder, and inexcusable ignorance of those Scriptures which they pretended to teach. Though so highly honoured by the confidence of Jesus, and at one time so ambitious of distinction and power among the rest, we find him afterwards characterized by the utmost humility and gentleness of spirit, assuming no authority over his brother apostles, nor "lording it over God's heritage," the church, as his usurping and pretended successors at Rome have always done. Some parts of his character and conduct were not faultless, as we have seen, but when these were pointed out and censured, we do not read that he offered to defend himself or persist in his course. He did not lay claim to sinless perfection, and his errors in judgment were those of a Jew upon whose mind the practices of the ancient religion of his country had taken strong hold, and who slowly came to see that those holy ordinances of Judaism were no longer binding, when the substance came in place of the shadow, and the reality was substituted for the type. His pretended successors have founded the whole of their system of superstitious observances upon his acknowledged errors, and have multiplied them ten thousand fold, and with an impious as-

sumption of infallibility preclude themselves from the possibility of repentance and reform. His Epistles, which were evidently written near the close of his labours, show that caution was then a strongly ruling principle of his character, and that he had learned, by his own experience, to inculcate upon others the danger of yielding to the impulses of an ardent temperament.

PHARAOH, the royal title of the ancient kings of Egypt, the etymology of which is variously stated by different writers. Le Clerc derives it from the root *pharah*, which signifies *to be exalted*, or *to be emperor*, while another writer, deducing it from the same word, which he interprets *to deliver*, contends that the title denotes one who is exempted from the jurisdiction of the laws. This inference, however, is utterly irreconcilable with the fact that the ancient kings of Egypt were subject to the laws, at least their power was of a much more limited nature than that of the Assyrian, Babylonian, and other Oriental despots, of which we have various intimations in the Scriptures. Another writer alleges that Pharaoh is the same as the Egyptian word *poura*, a king. Josephus tells us that all the kings of Egypt, from Minæus, or Menes, the reputed founder of the city of Memphis, who flourished long before Abraham, received the name of Pharaoh until the time of Solomon, but after that period he had discovered from the ancient records of the Jews that no king of Egypt had the title. In this statement he is evidently mistaken, for we find Egyptian kings of this name in the reigns of Hezekiah, Josiah, and Jehoiakim, and in the times of the Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, who were all much later than Solomon. After the conquest of Egypt, first by the Persians, and afterwards by Alexander the Great, the title *Pharaoh* ceased, and it is probable that the Egyptians gave the title to their kings as long as those kings were of their own nation, and as long as their own language was in use.

From the Fragments of Manetho it ap-

pears that each Egyptian king had a name peculiar to himself, and we certainly find the title of Pharaoh only in the Scriptures. Herodotus also informs us that in the books of the Egyptian priests, which were shown to him, and in which he found three hundred and thirty sovereigns registered, each prince had his own proper name. The early Pharaohs recorded in Scripture cannot be identified, especially those by whom the Hebrews were oppressed, from the circumstance that the Egyptian history, until the reign of Psammeticus, is involved in obscurity. There are ten Pharaohs introduced to our notice by the inspired writers, who are as follows:—

PHARAOH, the first known to us, is the king in whose time Abraham went into Egypt. See **ABRAHAM**.

PHARAOH, the second noticed in Scripture, reigned in Egypt in the time of Joseph. See **JACOB** and **JOSEPH**.

PHARAOH, the third in the inspired record, is the new king who “knew not Joseph,” and whose successors oppressed the Israelites. Of this race was the fourth

PHARAOH, before whom Moses appeared to demand the release of the Israelites, and in whose sight he inflicted the celebrated plagues. See **MOSES**.

PHARAOH, the fifth on record, is the prince who gave protection to Haddad.

PHARAOH, the sixth mentioned by the sacred historian, is the king whose daughter Solomon married. See **SOLOMON**.

PHARAOH, the seventh, otherwise called *Shishak*, is he who protected Jeroboam, and afforded him a refuge when he fled from Solomon. See **JEROBOAM**.

PHARAOH, the eighth, is mentioned as the Egyptian king with whom Hezekiah made a league against Sennacherib, king of Assyria. See **HEZEKIAH**.

PHARAOH, the ninth, is *Pharaoh-Necho*, supposed by some historians to have been the son of Psammeticus, who subdued Josiah.

PHARAOH, the tenth, is also called

Pharaoh-Ophrah, who entered into an alliance with Zedekiah, king of Judah, and attempted to assist him against Nebuchadnezzar. He is called Apries by Herodotus. The prophet Ezekiel uttered several prophecies against this Pharaoh, and he is mentioned by Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Habakkuk.

PHEBE, a Gentile female, whom St Paul calls "our sister," and "a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea," was the bearer of his Epistle to the Romans. He exhorts the Roman Christians to "receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that they assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of, for she had been a succourer of many, and of himself also." Some conjecture that Phebe was a deaconess—one of those women either widows, or who had been only once married, who were employed in the primitive church to teach the female catechumens, to visit and attend the sick, and to perform other offices of piety. Others suppose that Phebe spent her time in hospitably entertaining poor Christians, and that she had extended this kindness to the Apostle himself, as indeed he expressly intimates. Whoever she was, Phebe was evidently a person of great consideration in the Apostolic Church, whose good offices and excellent qualities deserved the high commendation bestowed on her by St Paul.

PHILEMON, an inhabitant of the city of Colosse, to whom St Paul wrote a short Epistle with his own hand, and from the manner in which the Apostle addresses him he was probably a person of some consideration in that city. From what is stated in the nineteenth verse, St Paul seems to have converted him to Christianity, and in the outset he designates him "our brother and fellow-labourer," in whose house a Christian congregation assembled. The term *fellow-labourer* has induced some to conclude that he held some ecclesiastical office at Colosse, but others contend that he was only a private Christian, who had shown a zealous and active disposition in the cause of Christianity. The occasion of St Paul's

Epistle to him may be briefly stated. Onesimus, one of his slaves, had robbed him, and run away from him, and had proceeded to Rome, where he was found by St Paul. The Apostle had instructed the slave in the truths of Christianity, and made him a sincere convert to the doctrines of the Gospel. He had expostulated with him on the sinfulness of his conduct, and the injury he had done to his master by unwarrantably and shamefully deserting his service, and he had positively enjoined to him the necessity of returning to Colosse and obtaining the forgiveness of his master. The converted Onesimus saw the propriety and justice of the Apostle's admonitions, and he professed himself both willing and anxious to return. St Paul accordingly wrote the inspired letter to Philemon, interceding with him in the most earnest manner to pardon Onesimus, speaking of him in terms calculated to soften Philemon's resentment, engages to make ample compensation for any injury he may have sustained, and entreats him to reconciliation and forgiveness by the now endearing connection of Christian brotherhood and affection. "Whether Philemon," says Dr Macknight, "pardoned Onesimus in consequence of this letter is not known. Only, from the earnestness with which the Apostle solicited his pardon, and from the generosity and goodness of Philemon's disposition, we may conjecture that he actually pardoned Onesimus, and even gave him his freedom, in compliance with the Apostle's insinuation, according to some commentators, that he would do *more than he said*; for it was no uncommon thing in ancient times to bestow freedom on such slaves as had obtained the good-will and esteem of their masters by their faithful conduct. At all events, the anxiety which the Apostle showed for the welfare of Onesimus, in return for his affectionate services, could not fail to cherish good dispositions in the heart of Philemon. Nor is it possible even at this day, so long after Philemon and his slave are both gone, to read this letter without experiencing in some measure the same happy effects."

PHILIP, called the Tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, was the brother of Herod, who was then tetrarch of Galilee, and both were sons of Herod the Great, though by different mothers. Herod Antipas seduced the wife of his half-brother Philip, and married her while her husband was alive. The marriage caused the severe reproofs of John the Baptist, who denounced it as a most daring outrage on the Levitical Law, and the bold invectives of that upright messenger of God brought him under the notice of the tyrant, who cast him into prison, and eventually suffered him to be beheaded. See **HEROD ANTIPAS**.

PHILIP, the Apostle, like several others of the Twelve, was an inhabitant of Bethsaida, and, like Andrew and Peter, was probably a fisher. We are informed by the credulous Metaphrastes, that he had been favoured with a good education, and had studied the writings of the Old Testament with such care, that he had come to the conclusion that the Messiah was then to appear. There is no hint of this kind given in the accounts of this Apostle which have been preserved in the sacred writings; and from the few allusions made to him, we will be led to an opposite conclusion. The report probably took its rise in the circumstance that Philip was first called to be a disciple and regular follower of Christ. Peter and Andrew had previously conversed with him, and come to the conviction that he was the promised Deliverer; but they seem to have returned to their occupation. Philip was most probably a hearer of the Baptist, and a witness of what happened when Jesus came to do honour to his forerunner, by accepting baptism at his hands. Some time after the temptation in the wilderness, when Jesus was going to travel through Galilee, he met Philip, and using the request or command which he did on all similar occasions, "Follow me," was immediately obeyed. We must conclude that he had heard Jesus before, at least that he was acquainted with the declaration of John concerning him. It was

probably some days after this when he met Nathanael, and communicated the great intelligence that the predicted Messiah was now come, and that Jesus of Nazareth was he. Nathanael, who was not a Galilean, had all the prejudices of the Jews against the rudeness of the illiterate and irreligious inhabitants of Galilee, as the Jews considered them. He stated the proverbial objection, that no prophet could arise out of Nazareth, one of the most despised towns of the province. Philip prudently would not argue, but requested Nathanael to come with him and judge for himself. This proposal was so reasonable that the doubting Israelite complied, and was convinced and converted.

We have every reason to believe that Philip thenceforth left all and constantly followed Jesus, though there is no ground for the story told by Clement of Alexandria, that he was the individual who requested leave first to go and bury his father, and that Jesus told him to let "the dead bury their dead,"—repeating the injunction to follow him. A year afterwards he was nominated an Apostle along with the rest; but we have little particular mention of him in the Gospels. It is probable that he had witnessed the miracle at the marriage of Cana; for when Christ was preparing to feed the five thousand by a similar miraculous exercise of power, he addressed himself to Philip, asking whence they would get bread to satisfy the hunger of so great a multitude? It is added by John, that Christ did this to try him—the meaning of which probably is, to see if he had already forgot the former miracle, which the disciples were prone to do. Philip was surprised at the question, and probably knowing the scanty treasury possessed by the whole, answered, that two hundred pence, or L.6, 9s. 2d., would scarcely be sufficient to afford a morsel to each of that great multitude. It is to be remarked, that on ordinary occasions Christ wrought no miracle to supply the wants of himself and his disciples. The next mention we meet with of this

Apostle is a short time previous to the crucifixion, when some Greek or Gentile proselytes applied to him during the Pass-over week to be introduced to the acquaintance of Jesus. We presume that the request was granted, though it is not mentioned. During those consolations and spiritual discourses, which Jesus pronounced at the last supper, he had said that "Henceforth they knew the Father, and had seen him." Philip did not understand this doctrine of the divinity of Christ, though the whole scope of his teaching and works, from the beginning of his ministry, had been to manifest that great truth, and eagerly subjoined, that if they saw the Father they would be abundantly satisfied. Jesus, in compassionate censure upon the slowness of this first called disciple to comprehend, after so long teaching, explained that it was only through himself that God was revealed and manifested to his creatures. All his doctrines gave this manifestation as clearly as human reason could comprehend; all the fulness of the divine perfections was manifested in his life and his works, and his miracles were sufficient proof that all was indeed of God. In the Acts of the Apostles we have frequent mention of the deacon of this name, and some of the ancient writers of the Church seem to mistake the one for the other, but of Philip, the Apostle, no mention is there made. We have reason to conclude, however, that he remained at Jerusalem with the rest of the Twelve till the early converts spread the knowledge of Christ into distant countries. It is reported by Nicephorus that he went to Upper Asia, and travelled even as far as Parthia and Scythia, preaching the gospel and working many miracles, and reclaiming the barbarous tribes from superstition and idolatry. It is not known how long he laboured in these distant regions, but it is said that he came at last to Hierapolis, in Phrygia, the name of which, the *sacred city*, intimates that it was the peculiar seat of idolatry. Among other objects of idolatrous veneration there was a serpent of enormous size, and, under

this mythological symbol, they pretended to adore Jupiter, who was believed to have frequently transformed himself into this reptile for the purpose of accomplishing his licentious intrigues. This serpent-worship, which prevailed to a wide extent in ancient heathen nations, was no doubt a perverted tradition of the seduction and fall of the human race, and in time the rebel usurper of the attributes of Deity contrived to obtain from his deluded victims the homage due to the Creator alone. Such abominable delusion grieved the mind of the zealous Apostle, and, either by miracle, by exposing the deception, as Daniel is reported to have done in the case of Bel and the dragon, or by argument, he convinced multitudes of the people of Hierapolis of the folly of their idolatry. He then set before them the character of the true God, and the only means of being reconciled to him by the blood of the cross. His success was great, and multitudes embraced the doctrines of the Gospel. As in the case of the Ephesian Diana, those who saw their lucrative trade in danger of being ruined by the universal desertion of their votaries, raised a violent persecution against Philip. He was seized, severely scourged, and cast into prison. There is a difference of statement in regard to his death; some relating that he was crucified, others that he was hanged on a pillar. It is reported that Nathanael or Bartholomew, whom he brought to Christ, was suspended on the cross at the same time, but that, an earthquake happening while they hung there, the people were terrified, and began to pray for mercy, and deprecate the vengeance of God. Bartholomew was taken down alive, and survived to pay the last duty to the lifeless remains of his brother Apostle. He is said to have been married and to have had daughters. The Gnostics pretend that he wrote a Gospel, and they had a spurious treatise, under his name, teaching their heretical notions. But no genuine writing of his was known in the Church, and, like several others of the apostles, he devoted all his labours to the

preaching of the truth, leaving to others the duty of recording the life and the doctrines of his Saviour.

PHILIP, called the *Deacon*, and one of the Seven Deacons ordained by the Apostles to assist them in their arduous duties, is prominently noticed in the Evangelical history, wherein he is styled *Philip the Evangelist*. We find him preaching the Gospel with great success at Samaria and throughout all Judea, and in a special manner directed by the Holy Ghost. But the most remarkable transaction recorded of him is his meeting with the Ethiopian Eunuch, a person of great rank and influence under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, supposed to indicate Abyssinia, or at least the region below Egypt called Meroë, which was the African Ethiopia. The piety of this Ethiopian nobleman induced him, although he had some thousands of miles to travel, to proceed to Jerusalem for religious purposes, and it was when returning from the holy city that Philip the Deacon, by Divine command, met him between Jerusalem and Gaza while sitting in his chariot reading the Prophecy of Isaiah. Philip came up to him, and asked—"Understandest thou what thou readest?" The Ethiopian instantly replied—"How can I, except some man should guide me?" He requested the Evangelist to enter his chariot beside him, and showed him the sublime and affecting passage contained in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah's Prophecy,—"He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before his shearers, so opened he not his mouth: in his humiliation his judgment was taken away, and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." The Eunuch said to the Evangelist—"I pray thee, of whom speaketh the Prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?" Philip immediately commenced an exposition of this and various other passages of the prophetic writings, showing that Jesus who had recently been put to death by the chief priests at Jerusalem was the Son of God and the Saviour of the world, informing him of all the great events which

had occurred, and that he was that long promised Deliverer of whom all the prophets wrote and spoke. The address of the Evangelist had the desired effect on the distinguished Ethiopian. Having no peculiar Jewish prejudices to surmount, he was enabled to perceive the value of that sacrifice which the Jews had disregarded, and his heart yielded a cordial assent to the truths of Christianity. As the Evangelist and his companion were proceeding on their journey, they came to a place where there was water, at which the latter exclaimed—"See, here is water, what doth hinder me from being baptized?" Philip replied—"If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." To this solemn appeal he answered—"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." They immediately proceeded to the water, and Philip baptized him. No sooner had they come from the water than "the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more." This miraculous disappearance of St Philip, as Dr Hales observes, was perhaps intended to afford the Eunuch an additional attestation of the truth of the new religion he had now gladly embraced. We are told that "he went on his way rejoicing," and thus, as Bishop Horne finely says, "he who came from Ethiopia, treasurer to Queen Candace, made his entrance into it again in a far different character—that of an apostle of Jesus Christ, full of joy in the Holy Ghost; for as such, the Ecclesiastical historians inform us that he was commissioned to preach the Gospel to his countrymen, the truth of which, it is related, he finally sealed with his blood." As for Philip, he was next found at Azotus, and passing hence he preached in all the towns on that part of the Mediterranean coast till he came to his own residence at Caesarea on the sea, a place distinguished in the early history of Christianity. Philip had four daughters, "virgins, which did prophecy," or were endowed with the gift of foretelling future events. This is an instance of the accomplishment of a prophecy by Joel, that in the times of the

Messiah, God would pour out his Spirit "on all flesh, on their sons and their daughters, servants and handmaidens." St Paul visited St Philip when at Cæsarea, on his way to Jerusalem. The residence of the Evangelist and his daughters is still pretended to be shown, and various interesting traditions connected with them are preserved.

PHINEHAS, the name of several persons mentioned in the Old Testament history, of whom the most prominent were Phinehas noticed by Moses, and Phinehas, one of the two wicked sons of the high priest Eli, whose fate, with that of his brother Hophni, caused the death of that venerable servant of God, but too indulgent father.

PILATE, or PONTIUS PILATE, the Roman governor and procurator of Judea whose name is inseparably connected with the great events of the crucifixion of our blessed Saviour. He filled this office in the fifteenth year of the proconsular empire of Tiberius Cæsar, or the twelfth of his sole empire, A.D. 25, or A.D. 26. Pilate continued in office ten years, or till after the crucifixion of Christ at the Passover, in the fifteenth of the sole empire of Tiberius, when the two Gemini were consuls of Rome. His character, as far as it is represented by the Evangelical writers in reference to his conduct at the condemnation of our Saviour, appears in rather a favourable light, considering that he was a believer in the Roman mythology, and knew nothing of the nature of the accusations preferred against Christ, or of the peculiar feelings of the Jews respecting their long expected Messiah. He concurred in condemning our Saviour, as he, like all the other Roman governors of provinces, had the power of life and death; yet his reluctance to do so, his repeated declarations that he found no fault in Christ, his earnest entreaties in his behalf, and his endeavours to allay the angry passions of the infuriated Jews, denote his willingness to have saved the Divine object of their hatred, and that he neither fostered nor took any part in

their malevolence. He looked upon the whole as a mere human transaction, or as a mere outbreak of popular fury occasioned by religious hatred, and it was not till he was threatened with an impeachment to the Emperor that he was induced to act judicially, and in compliance with the demands of the wretched Jews, whom he seems on all occasions to have despised. But it is from other writers that we learn the real character of Pilate. In the exercise of his government he had exasperated the Jews by his corruptions and oppressions; he had provoked them by dedicating some shields at Jerusalem, and he was so sensible of the odium in which he was held, that he feared the Jews would send an embassy to Rome, and complain to the Emperor Tiberius—whose will it was that none of their peculiar laws and customs should be violated—of the many crimes of his administration, his receiving of bribes, his extortions, his murders of many innocent and uncondemned persons, and other cruelties with which he was charged. After governing Judea ten years in this manner, he was at length commanded by Vitellius, president of Syria, to proceed to Rome, and answer the accusations of the Jews against him, while Marsellus, the friend of Vitellius, superseded him in the administration. He was obliged to obey, but before he arrived at Rome the Emperor had paid the debt of nature. He was deprived of his office on account of the charges proved against him, and was banished to Vienne in France. Eusebius assures us that he committed suicide, out of vexation for his many misfortunes, and driven to despair by the various calamities which had overtaken him, or in which he was involved. This happened in the place of his exile. Such was the melancholy end of a man who had sat in judgment on the Saviour of the world, and who had asked the Second Person of the glorious Trinity the important question, "What is truth?"

POTIPHAR. See JOSEPH.

POTIPHERAH. See JOSEPH.

PUBLIUS, the "chief man," or governor of the island of Miletus, otherwise Malta, whose father lay sick of a "fever and a bloody-flux," when St Paul was shipwrecked on that island. We are told that Publius received the Apostle and his companions very courteously, and lodged them three days. St Paul healed the father of this hospitable functionary, and it is probable also converted him to Christianity.

PUL, an ancient Assyrian king, who flourished B.C. 774, during the reign of

Menahem, king of the Ten Tribes. He was the first king of the great Assyrian empire, which in his time emerged from its obscurity, and within fifty years acquired universal dominion. We are told that "God stirred up the spirit of Pul," and he invaded Menahem, who, unable to resist this powerful conqueror, purchased a peace at the price of one thousand talents, or about three millions of shekels of silver, and became tributary to Assyria. Pul was succeeded by Tiglath-pileser.

Q

QUARTUS, a member of the church at Corinth, who sends his salutations to the Roman Christians in St Paul's Epistle written to them from that city. The Apostle calls him a "brother," and he is the last mentioned in that list which concludes the Epistle to the Romans, wherein St Paul offers salutations to and from the Christians of his acquaintance both at Rome and Corinth. It may be

here remarked, with Bishop Fell, that "the Apostle is very affectionate in these salutations, giving to almost every one some signal epithet, that he might both recommend them for their piety, and propose them to others for imitation, the more to endear their affections to him, to show his gratitude to them, and the honourable esteem he entertained for them."

R

RAB-SHAKEH, whose name signifies *cup-bearer of the prince*, or *chamberlain*, an officer of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, who, with Tartan and Rabсарis, was sent against King Hezekiah. He made a boasting speech to Hezekiah's deputation when he besieged Jerusalem in the hearing of the citizens, the design of which was to induce them to surrender the city, and from his familiarity with the Hebrew language some suppose that he was an apostate Jew, as his name simply denotes his office. Whether he was a Jew or not, Rab-shakeh knew something of the God of Israel, and cunningly pretended that his master Sennacherib had come with a divine commission. He affirmed that "the

Lord" was evidently on the side of the Assyrians, because he had already delivered the kingdom of the Ten Tribes into their hands, and subjected many nations to their power. See **HEZEKIAH**.

RACHEL, the favourite wife of Jacob, and the mother of Joseph and Benjamin, was buried "in the way of Ephrath," or Bethlehem, where her reputed tomb is still pointed out, and is held in great veneration. Her name is occasionally mentioned in a figurative manner by the inspired writers. See **JACOB**.

RAHAB, a woman of Jericho who kindly received and entertained the spies whom Joshua sent to view that city. She is called *an harlot*, but the real meaning of this unenviable designation has

been variously understood by commentators. See JOSHUA.

REHOBOAM, the son and successor of Solomon, and of Naamah, who is called an "Ammonitess," was elevated to the sovereignty of the kingdom about the year B. C. 975, according to the Hebrew chronology. The succession of this prince commenced a new era in the history of the chosen people, and was characterized by a revolt pregnant with the most important consequences, strongly indicating the arbitrary maxims which had prevailed with Solomon during the last years of his reign. The Israelites assembled at Shechem, the capital of the powerful tribe of Ephraim or Joseph, to make Rehoboam king, choosing it as the most central and convenient place, or, as some conjecture, because they could give utterance to their sentiments with greater security at Shechem than they could venture to do at Jerusalem. The chief men of the tribes wished to enter into a new stipulation with Rehoboam, which had been neglected at the accession of Solomon, and they came to the resolution that they would submit to his authority only on the condition that the severe and expensive exactions imposed by his father would be diminished. Rehoboam is described in the Second Book of Chronicles as "young and tender-hearted," which means that he was not literally *young*, for we are told that he was forty years old when he began to reign, but that he was ignorant of the nature of government, and acted at first as young and inexperienced princes occasionally do. He required three days to deliberate on their proposal, to which they readily acceded, during which time he consulted first with the older and more prudent counsellors, who advised him to grant the request of the discontented tribes without hesitation; and he then thought proper to consult the younger of his advisers, men of the same age, and of no more experience than himself, who, on the contrary, urged him not to yield in the slightest degree, but rather to threaten them with a more despotic rule if they made the

least complaint. Unhappily for Rehoboam, though it was in strict accordance with the wise purposes and arrangements of God—who often makes human passions, prejudices, and errors, subservient to the operations of his providence—Rehoboam chose the advice of the latter, and on the third day, when he met the assembled heads of the tribes, he declared to them, to their surprise and alarm—"My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke: my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." There could be no mistaking this tyrannical declaration, and, as soon as it was announced, ten of the tribes appeared in open and determined revolt. They exclaimed, in the memorable and emphatic words, in which there is a contemptuous allusion to the origin of Rehoboam's grandfather, "What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in Israel; now see to thine own house, David." They constituted themselves into a separate kingdom, and elected Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim—a tribe which had in ancient times received some obscure promises of a crown—to be their sovereign. The only tribes who remained faithful to Rehoboam were those of Judah and Benjamin, whose territorial possessions lay contiguous.

Thus, by the despotic obstinacy of Rehoboam, was the powerful empire of David and Solomon divided into two very unequal parts. Jeroboam possessed the Ten Tribes, with all the tributary nations as far as the Euphrates, which was in future called the kingdom of Israel, while Rehoboam retained only the two tribes already named, and which were viewed as one, because Jerusalem, the capital, was situated on the frontier of both. This was now called the kingdom of Judah, and comprehended Philistia and Edom, but the whole kingdom included scarcely a fourth part of the dominions of Solomon. The inspired historian informs us that the "cause," or the revolt, "was from the Lord, that he might perform his saying which the Lord

spake by Ahijah the Shilomite unto Jeroboam, the son of Nebat." This was during the reign of Solomon, when Ahijah foretold that Jeroboam would reign over Ten Tribes, though he was soon afterwards compelled to betake himself to Egypt on account of his treasonable practices, where he was obliged to remain till the death of Solomon. The tribe of Judah, to which Jeroboam belonged, had all along envied the precedence of Judah, and Jehovah now made them the instruments of correction to both, for the "cause was from the Lord," to fulfil the divine threat to Solomon and the divine promise to Jeroboam. And here are portrayed those incidental characteristics which distinguish sacred history from profane. In the former they are uniformly attributed to the Supreme Governor of the universe, guiding and directing the operations of all inferior agents according to his divine will and pleasure; in the latter they are usually attributed to secondary causes and human sagacity. On this subject Dr Graves has an admirable passage, which, though long, is worthy of being here introduced to the notice of the reader, as every sentence of it abounds with the most salutary and practical lessons of instruction. "The separation of the Ten Tribes from the house of David, and their establishment as a separate kingdom under Jeroboam, is an event which at first view may appear to indicate a total contempt of the Mosaic Law, since it was attended with deplorable schism and idolatrous corruption in the Jewish Church—a corruption which, as it was supported by worldly policy in the monarchs, and by the propensity to self-indulgence and idolatry in the mass of the people, was unhappily permanent, for every king of Israel, however praise-worthy in other respects, adhered to the 'sin of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin.' A close attention, however, to the circumstances of this event will show that it is perfectly consistent with the reality of that divine superintendence which directed the Jewish dispensation. The

origin of this separation is declared to have been a divine judgment on the house of David, in consequence of the idolatrous worship introduced by the foreign wives of Solomon, and criminally permitted or partaken of by that prince. If this offence had remained unpunished, so contagious an example would have probably infected the whole mass of the people, who would thus have irrevocably sunk into idolatry and vice; and does it not appear probable, that so long as the whole nation continued united under one sovereign this danger might frequently recur? Does not this division of the people under *two monarchs* appear even to our short-sighted views not only a just punishment for the crimes of Solomon, but the most probable method of preventing that universal apostasy caused by similar misconduct in future, which might have entirely defeated the design of the Jewish dispensation? Thus, we must consider this revolution in its first origin as a providential dispensation. Yet it was not brought about by any resistless operation of divine power—human passions and human agency were in appearance its only effective cause. The imprudent and tyrannical answer of Rehoboam to the demands of the Jewish people for a redress of grievances at the commencement of his reign was its immediate occasion, but when the king of Judah made preparations to reduce the revolted Tribes, the Deity interposed to prevent the miseries of civil war, in opposition to a measure originating in His decree, and commanded by His prophet—'Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren, for this thing is from me.' Nor should it be forgotten that this schism and idolatry of the Ten Tribes gave occasion for the most signal displays of Divine power, and the most emphatic denunciations and manifestations of Divine justice, in the correction and government of this perverse race and their guilty monarchs. The miraculous reproof and punishment of Jeroboam himself, the death of his favourite son, the utter destruction of the three royal houses

of Jeroboam, of Baasha, and of Ahab, all foretold by the Prophets, afforded awful examples of the divine vengeance. Among these Ten Tribes were also exhibited the miracles of Elijah and Elisha; concerning them, too, and their kings were pronounced some of the most distinguished prophecies of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah; and, finally, after a series of striking and instructive chastisements, God executed his final judgment on this deluded and corrupted race, for 'he removed Israel out of his sight.' Nor were corresponding effects wanting from this schism on the remaining Two Tribes, for it proved the most powerful means of preserving in them whatever degree of attention to the Divine Law subsisted among them. It made it the obvious political interest of the kings of Judah to adhere with strictness to the Law of Moses, and to promote its observance among their subjects—a line of conduct which became the boasted distinction of these kings, and the popular topic by which they maintained their superiority over the kings of Israel."

It is noticed in the preceding passage from Dr Graves that Rehoboam prepared to reduce the refractory and revolted tribes whom he naturally considered as rebels. While he was collecting an army for this purpose, he sent his collector of the tribute, named Adoram, to exercise his usual functions, but the appearance of this obnoxious officer exasperated the tribes, and they actually stoned him to death. The sending of Adoram at this crisis was in the highest degree imprudent, for he had the care of those very tributes of which they complained, and men naturally hate those who are the real or supposed instruments of their oppression. Rehoboam now saw that it was necessary to secure himself in Jerusalem, lest the popular vengeance should overtake himself. He at length collected an army of 180,000 men, but he was warned by the Prophet Shemaiah to relinquish the enterprise at the command of Jehovah, and he was still reasonable enough to see the propriety of obeying this inti-

mation. Nevertheless, no definite treaty of peace was concluded, and the frontiers of the two kingdoms always presented an hostile appearance.

Thus compelled to dismiss his army, the commencement of the reign of Rehoboam was not reprehensible. He fortified his cities, placed garrisons in them, with ample stores of provisions, and warlike implements, shields, and spears. As Jeroboam was considered an usurper by many among the Ten Tribes, they all resorted to the kingdom of Judah, and Rehoboam thus obtained a considerable accession of subjects. The conduct of Jeroboam, also, in setting up the golden calves, and in making priests of the lowest of the people, disgusted the Levites, and the legitimate priests, who "left their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem, for Jeroboam and his sons had cast them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord." But when Rehoboam saw himself, as he considered, firmly seated on the throne of his father, and that his now limited kingdom was prosperous and happy, he tolerated idolatry, which had already made great inroads during the last years of Solomon's reign. As a punishment for this misgovernment and toleration of religious corruptions, Shishak, king of Egypt, was divinely permitted to invade Judah with 12,000 chariots, 60,000 cavalry, and a great body of foot soldiers, collected from various African tributary nations. Rehoboam could offer no opposition to this overwhelming force, and Shishak not only became master of all his fortified towns, but obliged him to surrender Jerusalem without any conditions. This occurred in the fifth year of his reign. The Prophet Shemaiah announced to the king and the leading men of Judah that this calamity was brought upon them on account of their apostacy from God. Rehoboam and his courtiers expressed their sorrow and repentance, and Shemaiah received a Divine communication—"They have humbled themselves; therefore I will not destroy them, but I will grant them some deliverance; and my wrath

shall not be poured out upon Jerusalem by the hand of Shishak. Nevertheless they shall be his servants, that they may know my service, and the service of the kingdoms of the countries." Shishak, contented with the plunder of the Temple and of the royal treasury, returned to Egypt. Nothing farther is recorded of Rehoboam, who died after a reign of seventeen years, and was buried in Mount Zion in the sepulchre of the kings. The Prophet Shemaiah wrote a history of his reign which is now lost. We are told that there were "wars between Rehoboam and Jeroboam continually." Rehoboam had eighteen wives and sixty concubines, who bore to him twenty-eight sons and sixty daughters; but his favourite wife was Maachiah or Michaiah, who was the mother of Abijah his successor, and other three sons. She is stated in one place to have been the daughter of Absalom (2 Chron. xi. 20), and in another place the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. This intimates that her father was designated by both names. His name Absalom is rendered Abishalom in another passage, 1 Kings xv. 2.

REZIN, a king of Syria who was stirred up by God to attack Jotham king of Judah. An alliance was formed between Rezin and Pekin in the last year of Jotham's reign, but its effects did not appear till after his death, and during the reign of his idolatrous son and successor Ahaz. Rezin gained several advantages over Ahaz, who, notwithstanding a promise of divine assistance, chose rather to seek aid from Pul, king of Assyria, to whom he became tributary on the condition that he would compel Rezin and Pekah to relinquish their intention of destroying Judah. Rezin was subsequently slain by the king of Assyria, when that conqueror took the city of Damascus.

REZPAH, a concubine of Saul by whom he had two sons. They were delivered up by David to the Gibeonites, who put them to death.

RUFUS, a Christian at Rome to whom St Paul sends his salutations in

this affectionate manner—"Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine." He is probably the same Rufus, then living at Rome with his mother, who had treated the Apostle with such kindness that he cherished a filial regard for her, and who is mentioned by St Mark along with his brother Alexander as the son of Simon of Cyrene, who was compelled to bear the cross of Christ a part of the way from the city of Jerusalem to the neighbouring place of crucifixion. We may infer that both Rufus and Alexander were persons well known at the time when the Gospel was written.

RUTH, a Moabitess, who is the subject of the Book which bears her name, and which, independent of its importance as part of the inspired record, is of the greatest interest on account of the information it gives us of ancient pastoral life in Oriental countries. The widowed distress of Naomi, the dutiful attachment of Ruth, and the disconsolate return to Bethlehem, are beautifully narrated, while the simplicity of manners which is shown in the account of Ruth's industry and attention to Naomi—of the liberal charity of Boaz, and of his acknowledgment of his relationship to Ruth, affords a pleasing contrast to the turbulent scenes described in the preceding Book of Judges, to which it may be considered a kind of supplement, it being a detached story belonging to the same period, and to which indeed it is joined in the Hebrew canon. The respect also which the Israelites at this time of rural peace rendered to the Mosaic Law, and their observance of ancient customs, are represented in a most animated manner.

The story of Ruth is partly narrated in another place (see Boaz), and little remains except to point out a few particulars there only generally stated or omitted. We are not informed when Ruth lived. The Book opens with a short notice—"Now it came to pass in the days when the judges ruled, that there was a famine in the land." According to the Bible chronology this occurred about B.C. 1322. Archbishop

Usher conjectures that this refers to the administration either of Ehud or of Shamgar, while Bishop Patrick inclines to the opinion that the events occurred in the days of Gideon, from the fact of there having been then a famine in the land, which is the only famine recorded in the Book of Judges. A Hebrew named Elimelech, who belonged to Bethlehem-Judah, found it necessary to emigrate into the country of the Moabites with his wife Naomi, accompanied by their sons, Mahlon and Chilion. They had not been long in the country of Moab when Elimelech died, and Naomi became a widow. Her sons married two women of the Moabites named Orpah and Ruth, and after a residence of ten years they both died without offspring, leaving Naomi childless, with her two daughters-in-law. The unfortunate Naomi, bereaved of her husband, her sons, and her friends, and left destitute in a strange country, was reduced to the greatest distress, and she resolved to return to her native place. She that came from Bethlehem, as Bishop Hall observes, under the protection of her husband, attended by her sons, and stored with substance, resolved to find her way back to Bethlehem, through long, weary, and solitary deserts, alone and in poverty, "for she had heard in the country of Moab how that the Lord had visited his people in giving them bread."

This was about B.C. 1312, if we are to adopt the Bible chronology, but, as already remarked, there is nothing certain on this point, for it is to be observed that the whole narrative of the Book of Ruth is of a private nature, and the Hebrews, at the time it was written, whether by Samuel, Hezekiah, or Ezra, to each of whom it is attributed, may not have been much acquainted with its contents.

Naomi set out on her melancholy journey, accompanied by Orpah and Ruth, and she had not proceeded far when she earnestly entreated her daughters-in-law to return to their own relations, and to leave her to her own fate. "The Lord," she said to them, "deal kindly with you,

as you have dealt with the dead, and with me. The Lord grant you that ye may find rest, each of you in the house of her husband." She then kissed them, and took leave of them in the most affectionate manner. The two sisters-in-law weeping, and in the deepest distress, told her that they had resolved to go with her to her own people, but she answered them by referring to the custom which prevailed among the Hebrews and other nations, of the living brother, or nearest relative of the one deceased, marrying his widow, that the brother or relative's family might be perpetuated. She showed them that it was useless to indulge in vain expectations, and advised them to return—"Nay, my daughters," she said, "it grieveth me much for your sakes that the hand of the Lord is gone out against me," which means that God, in the dispensations of his providence, had reduced her to such circumstances that she could do nothing for them. Orpah took Naomi's advice, and taking an affectionate farewell, returned to her relatives, but Ruth positively refused to follow her, though strongly urged to do so. Her reply to Naomi is one of the finest passages of the inspired record—"Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest, I will go, and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the Lord do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me." The intensity of feeling and devoted attachment in this admirable passage cannot be surpassed in any language.

Naomi no longer expostulated with Ruth, and they proceeded on their journey together. The widows at length arrived at Bethlehem, and the appearance of Naomi excited the surprise of all who had seen her in the days of her prosperity. "Is this," they exclaimed, "Naomi?" "Is this the wife of the once wealthy Elimelech, who was a man of importance in Bethlehem?" The

bereaved widow, who had encountered all the evils of affliction and poverty, heard their observations. She replied in language expressive of her sufferings—"Call me not Naomi, call me Mara, for the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me. I went out full, and the Lord hath brought me home again empty: why then call ye me Naomi, seeing the Lord hath testified against me, and the Almighty hath afflicted me?"

It was the time of barley-harvest when this bereaved pair returned to Bethlehem, and one of Ruth's first acts was to repair to the fields, none of which are enclosed in the East, and glean after the reapers. She had obtained the permission of Naomi, and although it is not expressly stated, it is likely that poverty compelled her to adopt this expedient, sanctioned in the case of the poor by the Law of Moses (Lev. xix. 9, 10; Deut. xxiv. 19-21), to procure sustenance. It happened that she went into a field belonging to Boaz, a "mighty man of wealth," and a near relative of the deceased Elimelech—according to some his nephew. The arrival of Naomi and her daughter-in-law was well known to the inhabitants of Bethlehem, where Boaz resided, and the appearance of Ruth as a gleaner excited no surprise among the reapers; but Boaz had never seen her, and, though acquainted with all the circumstances, when he saw her he was anxious to know her name and connections. His appearance in the field to look after his reapers is a fine illustration of pastoral life in ancient times. "The Lord be with you," he said to his servants, and they replied, "The Lord bless thee." His inquiries respecting Ruth were readily answered by his confidential servant who was "set over the reapers," and he addressed her in a manner which intimated that he was well acquainted with her pious behaviour to her mother-in-law, the widow of his deceased kinsman, and of her earnest desire to be joined to the people of God, which she had evinced in leaving her native country. He told her to glean solely in his

field—that he had instructed his servants to show her the utmost kindness and attention—that she would be welcome to partake of their refreshments—and that none of his people would molest her. He even instructed his reapers to allow her to glean among the sheaves, and to drop handfuls purposely for her—a privilege which was occasionally conceded to the poor, not as a matter of right, for there was no command to this effect in the Mosaic Law, but as a matter of favour granted to any person whom the owner of the field wished to befriend.

When Ruth returned to Naomi in the evening with the corn she had gleaned, she informed her of all the transactions of the day, and of the condescending kindness of the owner of the field, whose name was Boaz. Naomi expressed her satisfaction at the account. "Blessed be he of the Lord," she said, "who hath not left off his kindness to the living and to the dead." She farther informed Ruth—"The man is near of kin unto us, one of our next kinsmen." In the margin this latter clause is rendered, *one that hath right to redeem, or one of our redeemers*. The meaning will be understood by again referring to the custom which prevailed among the Hebrews and other nations—that if a brother died and left a widow, his brother, or, if he had no brother, his nearest relative, was obliged to marry the widow. Naomi does not absolutely say that Boaz was their redeemer, for that would have implied that he was the person whom the Law would compel to act in the manner stated, so that his marriage with Ruth would have been a necessary consequence, unless he chose to submit to an alternative easy in itself, though attended with some degree of ignominy; but she says, *he is one of our redeemers*, and we accordingly find in the sequel of the narrative that there was a kinsman nearer than Boaz in relationship on whom that duty devolved; and if that kinsman refused, as he actually did, it was the right of Boaz to marry Ruth, and if he refused it devolved on the kinsman next in relationship.

Naomi was now resolved to provide Ruth with a husband, to lay the foundation for recovering the prosperous condition of her decayed family, and the generosity of Boaz induced her to hope that he would assist her in this matter. From the instructions she gave to Ruth it is evident that she wished Boaz to marry the fair Moabitess, but there was a nearer kinsman in the way, who must first relinquish his claim before such a connection could be formed. The conduct of Ruth also shows that she cherished towards Boaz the most devoted affection, though he was much her senior in years; and this attachment had been doubtless induced by the personal generosity she had experienced from the "mighty man of wealth" while she was unknown to him, and appeared as a poor and friendless stranger. The narrative which follows can only be understood by references to the primitive customs and simplicity of those ancient times. Naomi said to Ruth—"And now is not Boaz of our kindred, with whose maidens thou wast? Behold, he winnoweth barley to-night [in the evening, to obtain the advantage of the cool and refreshing breezes which continue more or less during the night] in the threshing-floor. Wash thyself therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee, and get thee down to the floor; but make not thyself known unto the man, until he shall have done eating and drinking. And it shall be, when he lieth down, that thou shalt mark the place where he shall lie, and thou shalt go in and uncover his feet, and lay thee down; and he shall tell thee what thou shalt do." Ruth literally obeyed Naomi's instructions; but before noticing the result, it ought to be observed that, though this action may seem hardly consistent with decency according to our usages and customs, which are different from those of the Orientals, there was nothing in it considered improper, when we take into account the peculiar circumstances, and the simplicity of rural manners in those early times. By this act Ruth reminded Boaz

of the relative situation in which they stood to each other—that he was bound to take her, a stranger, and the widow of the son of his kinsman, under his protection—that she subjected herself to his direction and control, and that she claimed from him the performance of those obligations sanctioned by the Law which devolved upon him as the kinsman of her deceased husband. There is therefore nothing indelicate or improper in the whole transaction, and it was not opposed to the usages of the times and of the country, especially in the *peculiar circumstances*; yet we find from the anxiety of Boaz, who did not wish it to be known that a woman had come to the threshing-floor, that it would not have been considered correct in *ordinary circumstances*.

When Boaz awoke at midnight he was astonished to find a woman lying at his feet, in the manner which Oriental servants often do as to position, who frequently sleep in the same tent with their masters, and always at their feet. In reply to the question of Boaz demanding who she was, the fair Moabitess replied, "I am Ruth, thine handmaid: spread therefore a skirt over thine handmaid, for thou art a near kinsman." She declared herself, by desiring Boaz to spread his skirt over her, entitled to that protection which a wife expects to receive from her husband, or, in other words, she reminded him of the legal obligation that she had a right to become his wife; and it is worthy of notice that the spreading of the skirt, cloak, or covering of the bridegroom over the bride is still a very important part of the marriage ceremony of the Jews and other Orientals. Boaz at once understood the intimation, and expressed his satisfaction at her conduct, intimating that this last act of kindness far surpassed in his opinion that which she had previously shown, more especially as she preferred him to a person more suitable to her age. He told her that he would willingly comply with her request, which he did the more readily as her character for virtue was well known

in Bethlehem; but he informed her that though he was indeed her near kinsman there was one still nearer than himself, and he told her to remain where she was until the morning, and if that nearer kinsman would not comply with the customary law, then he would "do the part of a kinsman" to her, in other words, that he would marry her, as the right would then devolve upon him. Early in the morning she retired from the threshing-floor with a present from Boaz of six measures of barley in her vail, for, according to Ruth's own statement he had said, "Go not empty unto thy mother-in-law." When she told Naomi all that occurred between her and Boaz, the widow of Elimelech replied—"Sit still, my daughter, until thou know how the matter will fall; for the man will not be in rest until he have finished the thing this day."

Naomi was right in her conclusion, and Boaz lost no time in showing his determination to do justice to the legal claims of Ruth. He went to the gate of Bethlehem—the usual seat of the judge, and the place of resort in every city in those times where public business was transacted. No tedious formalities were there observed—the party being merely summoned to make his appearance. As the transactions which now took place are given elsewhere (see Boaz), it may be merely observed, that the kinsman who was nearer in relationship than Boaz declined to act the kins-

man's part according to the Law, alleging that if he did so he would injure his own inheritance; and having thus renounced his legal claim or right according to the forms then authorized, Boaz necessarily became the nearest relative who was expected to fulfil the legal custom, and marry Ruth. This brings us to the conclusion of the history as given in the Book of Ruth. The offspring of this marriage was a son named Obed, who was the grandfather of David. Thus, then, we have the practical lessons to be drawn from this beautiful narrative—the merciful providence of God towards the afflicted, the widows, and the fatherless—the reward of constancy and obedience, and the blessing of Heaven upon those who fear and trust the beneficent Dispenser of the gifts of Providence. But the Book of Ruth must also be viewed as of great importance in the inspired canon, because it makes us acquainted with the genealogy of David, from whom the Messiah was to spring; and some learned commentators think that the descent, humanly speaking, of our blessed Saviour from Ruth, a Gentile, is an intimation of the comprehensive nature of the Gospel dispensation. It had been foretold to the Jews that the Messiah was to be of the tribe of Judah, and it was revealed further that this Messiah was to be of the family of David. In the Book of Ruth, therefore, we have a suitable introduction to the prophecies concerning the Messiah and their accomplishment.

SAMSON, a celebrated Judge of Israel, whose name has become proverbial to express strength and muscular power. He was the son of Manoah, of the tribe of Dan, and was born about the year B.C. 1161, according to the Bible chronology. Samson's birth was announced in a manner too remarkable to be overlooked. The Israelites were undergoing the punishment of one of their usual relapses

into idolatry by the oppressions of their powerful enemies the Philistines, during which an angel appeared to the wife of Manoah, who had hitherto been childless, and announced to her that she would "conceive and bear a son, for the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb; and he shall begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines." The word from which *Nazarite* comes

signifies to *separate* or *abstain*, and a Nazarite was one separated from others by a profession of some extraordinary and special acts of religion. The Nazariteship, if we may so call it, might be during the natural life, as in the cases of Samson and John the Baptist, or it might be for any limited period, even for one week. It was ordered in the Mosaic Law that the Nazarite was not to "make himself unclean for his father, or for his mother, for his brother, or for his sister, when they die, because the consecration [or *separation*] of his God is upon his head." The meaning is, that he was not to attend any funeral solemnity, or to mingle in any public affairs whatever, but that he was to look upon himself as entirely consecrated to God during his Nazariteship, whether for life or limited, and to abstain in every case as much as the high priest himself. It is evident, however, from the frequent intercourse of Samson with the Philistines, and the great slaughter he often made among them, that Nazarites could obtain dispensations, exempting them from the rigid observance of some of the rules laid down in the sixth chapter of the Book of Numbers. The hair of the head of a Nazarite was consecrated to God, and in the case of perpetual Nazarites was never shaven, whatever defilement they might contract. Women were also permitted to become Nazarites, and we may perhaps look to this singular institution under the Law for the origin of monks and nuns in the Roman Catholic Church.

It was ordered that when a person "vowed the vow" of a Nazarite, he was to "separate himself from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried. All the days of his separation [whether for life or otherwise] shall he eat nothing that is made of the vine tree, from the kernels even to the husk." We accordingly find that Samson's mother during her pregnancy was commanded to live as the Nazarites did, and to abstain from

"wine and strong drink," and from eating any thing unclean. She communicated to her husband the instructions of the heavenly messenger, and Manoah earnestly entreated that he would be again permitted to "come again unto them, and teach them what they were to do unto the child that shall be born." His prayer was granted, and the heavenly messenger appeared to Manoah's wife when she was in the field. She ran and informed her husband, who instantly came, and asked, "Art thou the man that spake unto the woman?" A reply was made in the affirmative, and Manoah said, "Now let thy words come to pass. How shall we order the child, and how shall we do unto him?" The angel replied, "Of all that I have said unto the woman let her beware. She may not eat of any thing that cometh of the vine, neither let her drink wine or strong drink, nor eat any unclean thing. All that I commanded her let her observe."

All this time Manoah was ignorant that the heavenly messenger was any other than a prophet, and he farther said—"I pray thee, let us detain thee, until we shall have made ready a kid for thee." But this offer of hospitality was rejected by the angel. "Though thou detain me," he said, "I will not eat of thy bread; and if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering thou must offer it unto the Lord." Manoah then said—"What is thy name, that when thy sayings come to pass we may honour thee?" The angel replied—"Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret?" Manoah prepared the kid for the burnt-offering, and the angel "did wonderously," namely, wrought a great miracle, for he caused fire from heaven to consume the sacrifice as an acceptable offering to God, and then himself ascended in the flame and disappeared, to the astonishment of Manoah and his wife, who fell on their faces to the ground. Manoah in the greatest alarm said—"We shall surely die, because we have seen God;" but his wife took a different and more rational view of the extraordinary occurrence. "If the Lord," she replied,

"were pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt-offering and a meat-offering at our hands, neither would he have showed us all these things, nor would as at this time have told us such things as these." She argued, observes Pyle, that "such gracious appearances, on so comfortable a message, with so wonderful an acceptance of their offering, plainly bespoke the favour and not the anger of God, and that therefore they might rest assured that the promise would be fulfilled."

In due time Manoah's wife bare a son, and called his name Samson, the meaning of which name is uncertain, but it is probably derived from the Hebrew *shemesh*, or *the sun*, denoting him to be the *light* and *strength* of Israel. During his infancy and youth he was peculiarly the object of the divine care—"the child grew, and the Lord blessed him;" and when he arrived at manhood, "the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times in the camp of Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol," or rather, "in the camp of Dan, and between Zorah and Eshtaol," for that camp was in or near the tribe of Judah, and had no connection with Zorah and Eshtaol.

It is already observed, that the Nazarites must have been entitled to dispensations from observing their vows to the letter, and of this we have an example in the case of Samson. When he was in his twentieth year, B. C. 1141, according to the Bible chronology, he formed an attachment to a Philistine woman whom he saw at Timnath, a place in the tribe of Dan on the frontiers of the Philistines, who at this time oppressed the Israelites, and made them tributary. Here an observation of Bishop Hall occurs, which ought not to be forgotten. "Of all deliverers of Israel," he says, "there is none of whom are reported so many weaknesses as Samson; all his strength begins in infirmity. One maid of the Philistines overcomes the champion who was destined to overcome the Philistines." He requested his father and mother to obtain her for him in marriage. The Israelites

were forbidden to intermarry with any of the inhabitants of Canaan, and though the Philistines were not one of the seven nations of Canaan, they were under the same condemnation, and their country was included in the territory of the Tribes. In the spirit of this prohibition Samson's parents demanded, "Is there never a woman among the daughters of thy brethren, or among all thy people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines?" But the youthful hero persisted in his request, and his parents made no farther remonstrance. The inspired historian informs us that "his father and mother knew not that it was of the Lord, that he sought an occasion against the Philistines." This statement probably intimates that God intended to bring good out of Samson's evil, and not to approve of conduct which was opposed to the injunctions of the Mosaic Law.

Samson and his parents proceed to Timnath to make arrangements for his marriage, and on the way a remarkable proof of his strength was given. A "young lion roared against him," and the term *young lion* here does not mean a whelp, for which the Hebrew has a different word, but a young lion arrived at its full strength and size, when the animal is much fiercer than at a later period of its life. This is one of several intimations in Scripture that lions formerly existed in Judea, although none are at present found in that country, and several places, such as Lebaath and Beth-Lebaath, took their names from that circumstance. Other authors corroborate the Scripture statement in this particular. We are told that the "Spirit of the Lord came mightily" upon Samson, namely, he was suddenly endued with an extraordinary measure of strength, and he "rent the lion as he would have rent a kid, and he had nothing in his hand." This must be viewed as a very remarkable exploit. Curtius mentions that when Alexander the Great was hunting in Syria he was assailed by a large lion, which he slew, and if this was justly considered a great feat, even although Alexander was armed with

a hunting spear, it becomes comparatively trivial when mentioned with that of Samson, who overcame a lion when he was unprovided with any kind of weapon.

Samson, for reasons not stated, concealed this exploit from his parents, and proceeded to Timnath, where the Philistine maid resided whom he loved, and we are told that he "talked" with her, and she "pleased him well." After a time he "returned to take her," which probably means that she was betrothed to him in the first instance, and the interval noticed was that space which was considered necessary to elapse between the betrothing and the actual marriage. The length of the interval depended on circumstances, but though young people were often affianced by their parents when mere children, in general the time was seldom less than ten or twelve months, and this, as we shall immediately see, must have been the space or "time" mentioned by the inspired historian. During this interval, as is intimated in the case of Samson, the man and woman, though considered married persons, had little if any intercourse with each other, but the modern Jews, who still follow the custom of betrothing, retain so much of their ancient Oriental ideas as to consider it improper for a young man and woman to walk together without being betrothed. It appears from what follows that some months must have elapsed after Samson's exploit with the lion at this visit to Timnath, for when he returned to bring home his bride, he "turned aside to see the carcase of the lion," in which he found a swarm of bees and honey. The interval of these visits to Timnath must therefore have been several months, and during that time the carcase of the animal had been reduced to a clean skeleton, which would form a suitable reception for the bees which abounded in that region. This would particularly be the case if it remained covered with some portions of dried skin, or if it was in a secluded place among bushes or high grass, which seems to be intimated by Samson's *turning aside* to

view his ferocious assailant. It has been objected to this passage that bees are naturally of such cleanly habits, and have such a well known repugnance to impure smells, that it is not likely a swarm of them would locate themselves in the putrifying carcase of any animal; but it must also be considered that a few days for birds, and the same time for beasts of prey, to devour the flesh would soon clear the skeleton of every particle, and in a few days more the heat of the sun in that country would absorb all the moisture from the bones, and from any part of the hide which remained. Samson took some of the honey and "went on eating, and came to his father and mother, and he gave them, and they did eat; but he told not them that he had taken the honey out of the carcase of the lion." His motives for concealing this transaction are not obvious. They may have probably been prudential considerations, with which we are altogether unacquainted.

When the interval of the betrothing had expired Samson went to Timnath to celebrate his marriage. He made there a feast on the occasion, for "so the young men used to do," and this feast, which was called by the Jews the *nuptial joy*, and all labour ceased during its continuance, lasted seven days. It is to be here observed that Samson, according to the usages of the East, made his feast at the house of some acquaintance, or in one hired for the occasion, for in reading the narrative it must not be forgotten that he was a stranger in Timnath, and his own residence was far distant, while at the same time the bride entertained her female friends and relatives at her father's house. The different sexes never feasted together on any occasion, and it was only under very peculiar circumstances that the bride and bridegroom gave their respective entertainments in the same house. We have, however, one well known exception to these general usages in the case of the marriage feast at Cana, where our Saviour was present. This was evidently held in the same house, and

females were admitted, as his mother is expressly stated to have been there. We are told that on the occasion of Samson's marriage they "brought thirty companions to be with him," and from this statement we are perhaps to understand that it was not a regular custom for the bride's friends to provide the bridegroom with any number of companions or bride's-men, but that in this, as in any other similar instance, it was done because Samson was a stranger in the place, and it was thought necessary to give his marriage as important an appearance as possible.

The whole of the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Judges, in which these incidents are recorded, abounds with many curious references to Oriental customs, and in fact the chapter, like many others in the Old Testament Books, cannot be well understood unless the reader has some knowledge of these usages. It was an expensive affair to feast thirty persons for a week, though it is quite Oriental, and it is well known that in the East very considerable sums are often spent on such occasions by parties who can otherwise hardly sustain the profusion. These remarks are not intended to apply to Samson, who was evidently a person of wealth and influence among the Israelites, but they tend to illustrate what the inspired historian now introduces to our notice. It was a very ancient custom among the Oriental nations, which prevailed among the Greeks and others, to relieve their entertainments by proposing difficult and obscure questions, to the solution of which a reward was annexed equivalent to the forfeiture which inability incurred. Samson said to his guests—"I will now put forth a riddle unto you: if ye can certainly declare it me within the seven days of the feast, and find it out, then I will give you thirty sheets and thirty change of garments; but if ye cannot declare it me, then shall ye give me thirty sheets and thirty change of garments." In the margin the word *sheets* is rendered *shirts*, a reading which is doubtless to be preferred, and the

meaning is, that he offered thirty dresses, each of which probably consisted at that time only of a shirt and upper garment. Samson's guests requested him to "put forth" his riddle, and he accordingly said to them—"Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness." This enigma, which apparently involved contradictions, puzzled the ingenuity of the marriage guests three days, and finding they could not explain it, and yet unwilling to incur the forfeiture, they came to Samson's wife, and said to her—"Entice thy husband, that he may declare unto us the riddle, lest we burn thee and thy father's house with fire: have ye called us to take that we have? is it not so?" This last clause means, as it were, "Have ye called us to this wedding to impoverish us, seeing that we must pay the forfeit on account of our inability to solve the riddle?" Samson's wife "wept before him," and commenced a well directed attack on her husband, in which she employed all her arts, caresses, and endearments, mingled with reproaches. "Thou dost but hate me," she said to him, "and lovest me not; thou hast put forth a riddle unto the children of my people, and hast not told it me." To this he replied—"Behold, I have not told it my father nor my mother, and shall I tell it thee?" He resisted all her entreaties until the seventh day of the feast, when "she lay sore upon him," which means that she made him uneasy by her importunities, and he then gave her the solution, which she immediately communicated to the guests. On the seventh day they asked Samson triumphantly, "What is sweeter than honey, and what is stronger than a lion?" To this he significantly replied—"If ye had not ploughed with my heifer, ye had not found out my riddle,"—meaning that they would not have discovered it if they had not tampered with his wife, or used her as the means of obtaining the solution from himself. The indignant Samson resolved to make the Philistines pay dear for the discovery of his enigma. He went to Ascalon on the Mediterranean,

about twenty-four miles distant from Timnath, and then the chief city of one of the five principalities of the Philistines, where he slew thirty men, and stripped them of their dresses, which he gave to his marriage guests to pay the forfeiture on his part. He then in anger left his wife with her own relations in Timnath, and went to reside with his father Manoah. We are informed that his wife was "given to his companion, whom he had used as his friend," and that this was done by her father. This *friend* was probably the person at an Oriental marriage who is called the "friend of the bridegroom" in the New Testament, and whose office was the most delicate and confidential, devoting himself for a time solely to the affairs of the bridegroom. Before the day of the marriage he was the usual channel of communication between the bridegroom and the bride, and during the whole festivity he was in constant attendance, exerting himself to the utmost to promote the hilarity of the guests and the happiness of the bridegroom. It is evident that a person so placed has many facilities of forming an acquaintance with the bride, and of gaining her favourable notice, and Samson must have been peculiarly distressed at the treachery of one whom he had so lately trusted.

This transaction took place during Samson's absence. He had left his wife in anger at the mode in which she extorted the solution of his riddle from him, and enabled her Philistine guests to obtain the forfeiture of the thirty dresses, but he intended to return and claim her; and we accordingly find that some time afterwards his love for her revived, and he visited her with the delicate and delicious present of a kid. The transference of his wife to his *friend* was unknown to him, and when he presented himself at her father's house, and demanded to be admitted to her apartment, he was not allowed to enter. Her father said, in explanation of his conduct, "I verily thought that thou hadst utterly hated her; therefore I gave her to thy companion: is not her younger sister fairer than she?"

Take her, I pray thee, instead of her." This is a very conclusive proof of the licentious habits of the Philistines at that period, when we find even a father giving an advice like this to his son-in-law whom he had deeply injured. Samson seems to have turned away in scorn and indignation, without making any reply, exclaiming aloud, or revolving in his mind, that he would be revenged of the Philistines for the injury he had sustained, and that they were themselves the cause of the mischief he intended to do them. We are told that he caught "three hundred foxes, and took firebrands (or *torches*), and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails; and when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, with the vineyards and olives." This remarkable exploit deserves a special notice. It is now generally agreed that the Hebrew word *shual*, rendered *fox* in our version, signifies in most cases the *jackal*, a well known animal between the wolf and the fox. Jackals associate together like wolves, and in Palestine form packs of some hundreds, prowling about at night in search of prey, which with them chiefly consists of carrion. To obtain this they approach the towns and villages, and the streets of towns when they can gain admittance, and it is even necessary to secure the graves of persons recently interred, to prevent the corpses from being devoured by these animals. They conceal themselves during the day in holes and corners, and do not at any time molest man, unless when they can do so with advantage to themselves, as when he is asleep, or is disabled by wounds or sickness. This explanation completely refutes the objection often urged against this transaction of Samson, that so large a number of foxes could not be easily caught. Travellers inform us that hundreds of jackals prowl together in packs, differing in this respect from the fox, an animal, which is not gregarious: and we are also to observe, that the text does not warrant us to conclude that Samson

caught them all unassisted, or at the same time. In the Scriptures a person is often described as doing what he ordered to be done, and such a person as Samson would find little difficulty in procuring whatever aid he wanted. The animals were tied "tail to tail," to prevent them from running to their holes, and in such a manner as to cause them to pull in different directions, bearing the "firebrand" or torch between them. The only difficulty is to understand what kind of firebrand was employed, and the manner in which it was conveyed by the jackals. There is reason to believe, however, that there was nothing either new or uncommon in Samson's mode of punishing the Philistines, and every reader knows the facility with which the produce of the ground may be set on fire during the drought of summer. An expressive provision was made for this disaster in the Mosaic Law, *Exod. xxii. 6*. "If a fire break out, and catch in thorns, so that the stacks of corn, or the standing corn, or the fields be consumed therewith, he that kindled the fire shall surely make restitution." Both Greek and Roman authors frequently allude to mischief done to standing corn by sending different animals, foxes among others, into it, with firebrands attached to them. *Ovid*, in particular (*Fast. iv. 680*), mentions an annual custom observed at Rome of turning out foxes with burning torches on their backs into the Circus, and *Bochart* describes this as having been derived from Samson's exploit.

When the Philistines saw the devastation caused by these animals—that their "standing corn" was burnt, with the "vineyards and olives," they naturally asked who had done them this most serious injury. They were soon informed both of the actor and of the motive which induced him to commit this havoc in their fields—"Samson, the son-in-law of the Timnite, because he hath taken his wife, and given her to his companion." The consequence was, that the persons whose produce had been injured or destroyed by the fire which Samson had kindled attacked the Timnite in a tumultu-

ary manner, and burnt him and his daughter with fire. Here we are to observe that the threat which had before frightened Samson's wife to act treacherously to her husband in the solution of his enigma is now executed, in consequence of the results produced by that treachery. It is difficult to assign any satisfactory reason for the conduct of the Philistines on this occasion. In the next verse Samson says, with reference to this cruelty to his wife and her father—"Though ye have done this, yet will I be avenged of you, and after that I will cease." It would appear from this that they intended to propitiate him by the commission of this deed, and to prevent any farther aggression, but that he did not think he had sufficiently availed himself of the opportunity of avenging the cause of Israel which the conduct of the Philistines towards himself had offered.

Samson was not long in following up his resolutions. He smote a number of the Philistines "hip and thigh," though the particular occasion is not mentioned, and then retired to a rocky hill called Etam, which *Josephus* tells us was within the western frontier of the tribe of Judah; but the exact position or identity of which is not known. The position in which Samson was now placed deserves a special notice. He was from his birth the appointed avenger of the Israelites, but seeing that they had become contented slaves from a fear of offending the Philistines, he was obliged to act individually, in transient and desultory attacks; and, that the Israelites might not be committed against their will, he evidently wished these attacks to be considered as acts of revenge and retaliation for his own personal wrongs. This explains the whole of the remarkable history of Samson. His first public act was his attachment to the fair Philistine of Timnath, whom he married in opposition to the wishes of his father and mother, because "they knew not that it was of the Lord that he sought an occasion against the Philistines." On this transaction the whole history of Samson rests,

and the subsequent acts or operations resulted from it. As in none of his desultory attacks he at any time committed the Israelites as a nation, we find that the retaliatory measures of the Philistines were never directed against them, but against Samson personally, which shows that they considered him as acting on his own account; whereas he was actually taking occasion, from his private wrongs, to avenge the oppressions of his people, for which purpose he well knew that he had been raised up, and endowed with extraordinary strength. The slaughter of the Philistines by Samson, before he retreated to the rocky hill of Etam, caused them to march a strong military force into the tribe of Judah. The Israelites, astonished at this hostile movement, demanded the cause, and they were answered that it was resolved to take Samson and put him to death. We are told that three thousand of the men of Judah immediately proceeded to Etam, and held a conference with Samson. They remonstrated with him on his conduct, but he insisted that he was merely revenging his own private injuries. They informed him that they had come to bind him, and deliver him to the Philistines. He made them positively declare that they would do him no injury themselves, and he willingly permitted them to bind him with two new cords. In this manner they brought him from the rocky eminence, and when the Philistines saw their enemy approaching in such a condition they raised a loud shout of triumph. But their rejoicings were of brief duration; for the "Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and the cords that were upon his arms became as flax that was burnt with fire, and his bands loosed (or *were melted*) from off his hands." He found a "new (or *moist*) jawbone of an ass," which he took, and slew with it a thousand of his enemies, exclaiming, when he had sufficiently avenged himself—"With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, with the jaw of an ass have I slain a thousand men." He called the scene of this singular transaction

Ramath-Lehi, or the *Hill of the Jawbone*. The word *lehi*, which Samson applied to the place, means *jawbone* in Hebrew. "From a fondness for miracles," says Dr Hales, "it would seem several of the ancient versions, followed by the English translation, understand *Lehi* here to denote the *jawbone* of the ass, rather than the *place* so called, which is at variance with the sequel. The marginal reading is correct." All commentators concur in this opinion.

The next exploit of the Hebrew hero to which our attention is directed is his proceeding to Gaza, the capital of the most southern of the Philistine principalities, and carrying away the gates. In this city resided a woman of infamous character with whom Samson had become acquainted, and whom on this occasion he visited. The inhabitants of Gaza were informed of the arrival of the enemy of the Philistines in their city, and lay in wait for him at the gate all night, with the intention of killing him in the morning. Samson remained with his paramour till midnight, when he rose, and "took the doors of the gate of the city, and the two posts, and went away with them, bar and all, and put them upon his shoulders, and carried them up to the top of an hill that is before Hebron." We must understand this hill as being *before*, or on the road to, Hebron, but not *near* it, for Gaza is twenty miles from Hebron. The hill to which Samson is said to have carried the gates is still pointed out by the inhabitants of the present Gaza, and is remarkable as being higher than the others, and as having on the summit a mosque surrounded by the tombs of Mahometans. The peculiar circumstance in this transaction is, that such a man as Samson should have become acquainted with a woman of a base character, and shows the corruption of manners which had spread throughout the Israelitish nation. While he appeared among the Philistines as an instrument of Divine Providence to check, single-handed, their oppressive power, he suffered himself to become a slave to the love of licentious women, nor

did he apparently make any distinction between those who were Israelites or the daughters of idolaters. "We cannot," says Bishop Hall, "wonder more at Samson's strength than at his weakness; and he that began to cast away his love upon a Philistine wife went on to mis-spend his time with a Philistine harlot. His affections blinded him first ere the Philistines could do it. Would he otherwise, after the effusion of so much of their blood, have suffered his passions to carry him within their walls, as one that cared more for his pleasure than for his life? How easily do vigour of body and infirmity of mind lodge under one roof! Samson's victories subdued him, and made him first a slave to lewd desires, and then to the Philistines."

We now come to the closing scene of the life of this extraordinary hero of sacred antiquity, in which these observations are remarkably verified. Some time after the exploit at Gaza, he visited a woman named Delilah whom he loved, and who lived in the Valley of Sorek. It is not mentioned whether this Delilah was an Israelitish or a Philistine woman. Some are of opinion that she was his wife, but this fact is not noticed, and as it appears from her whole conduct that she was a woman who would do any thing to obtain money, Josephus is probably right in the view he takes of her character. Samson's connection with Delilah was well known, as was also the influence she exercised over him; and the chiefs of the Philistines contrived to bring her over to their interest, that they might get him into their hands. They said to her—"Entice him, and see where his great strength lieth, and by what means we may prevail against him, that we may bind him to afflict him, and we will give thee every one of us eleven hundred pieces of silver." These pieces of silver were probably shekels, and as a shekel was about equal in value to half-a-crown, the five thousand five hundred pieces of silver from the five lords of the Philistine principalities would amount to £577—no inconsiderable sum at that time in

that country. Delilah readily accepted the offer, and undertook to obtain the secret from him. On three several occasions, however, she failed, and the Philistines, who placed men secretly in her house to seize him, were mortified and disappointed; but he at length yielded to her importunities, and said to her—"There hath not come a razor upon mine head, for I have been a Nazarite unto God from my mother's womb; if I be shaven, then my strength will go from me, and I shall become weak, and be like any other man." Delilah saw that he had "told her all his heart," and sent due notice to the lords of the Philistines, who joyfully paid her the promised reward of her treachery. She made Samson "sleep upon her knees," in a position often indulged in the East, where a person, extended or reclining on the floor, rests his head on the lap of another as on a pillow, and in this state of delusive ease she "called for a man, and she caused him to shave off the seven locks of his head." It is worthy of observation as illustrating this statement, that the Oriental barbers pursue their common avocation of shaving the head with such dexterity and ease, that the most delicate sleeper would not be awakened by it, and even those who are awake are scarcely sensible of the operation they are undergoing. Samson awoke unconscious of the treachery practised upon him, and said, "I will go out as at other times before, and shake myself;" and he "wist not that the Lord was departed from him." In this condition he was seized by his enemies, who put out his eyes, and carried him to Gaza, where he was put in chains, and thrown into prison. Here he was condemned to the servile employment of grinding corn with mill-stones worked by the hands, which is still the usual method of grinding corn in the East. As this employment devolves upon women, the assigning of it to Samson was evidently to reduce him to the lowest state of degradation, and he seems to have been made the general grinder to the "prison-house."

Samson had now time for reflection, and he must have felt that his state of misery and degradation was the result of his own weak and dissolute conduct, which had completely frustrated the high promise of his birth, and it was probably on this account that he did not *deliver*, but only *began* to deliver Israel, as the angel had foretold. The Israelites must be blamed for not embarking in the struggle with their hero, but his private and personal character does not seem to have inspired them with confidence. In this respect the history of Samson is most instructive, and throughout we perceive that if his obedience to the Law of God had been greater, and his discretion more in accordance with his obvious duty, his fate would have been very different. As general grinder of the prison-house he continued a considerable time, exposed to a thousand insults. His hair began to grow, and his strength returned. It appears that his debased condition moved him to repentance for his past misconduct, and that he renewed his vow of Nazariteship, which included the consecration of his hair, for we are not to suppose that his extraordinary strength was a mere matter of thews and sinews, but was rather vested in him as an extraordinary gift from God on the condition of his remaining a Nazarite. Having renewed his vow, God accepted his repentance, and re-invested him, as his hair grew, with those powers with which he had wilfully trifled.

The Philistines celebrated a great festival in honour of their idol Dagon, as a general thanksgiving for delivering their dreaded enemy into their hands. On this occasion all their lords, and some thousands of men and women, assembled in the temple of the idol, or of some building erected for the purpose, and Samson was carried from the prison-house to this place that his oppressors might exult over him, and expose him to insult and derision. He was bound to two pillars, which were the principal supports of the building—an edifice strictly in unison with Oriental designs, and in this

condition he was compelled to “make sport”—a statement probably referring to the exhibition of some feats of strength. He requested permission to be allowed to feel the pillars on which the weight of the building was supported, that he might lean upon them; and this being granted, he resolved to humble the pride of the oppressors of Israel, though the act would prove fatal to himself. He exclaimed—“O Lord God, remember me, I pray thee, and strengthen me, I pray thee, only this once, O God, that I may be at once avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes.” He then took hold of the supporting pillars, and bowed himself with all his extraordinary strength toward the ground. The building immediately gave way, and fell upon the lords of the Philistines and the whole assembly, who were all involved in this terrible calamity, so that “the dead which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life.” His body was found among the ruins amid the mangled corpses of his enemies, and he was buried by his relations in the sepulchre of his father Manoah, between Zorah and Eshtaol, B.C. 1120.

As Samson judged Israel twenty years, it is probable that he committed many acts of personal aggression against the Philistines which are not recorded. It is unnecessary to give any delineation of the character of this extraordinary man, as it is sufficiently brought out in the preceding narrative. It is remarkable that the history of almost every nation mentions some hero, whose exploits, far beyond the ordinary range of human power, bear an analogy or resemblance to those of Samson. We have the famous Hercules of classical mythology, Roostem of Persia, Antar of Arabia, and Rama of India; and some writers have attempted to prove that the accounts of these personages are based on traditions of the exploits of the Hebrew champion. It is certain that striking coincidences may be traced, which, whether connected with Samson or not, amply illustrate what the inspired historian was authorized to record

concerning him for the instruction and improvement of the world.

SAMUEL, an eminent Prophet and distinguished Judge of the Israelites, was born in the year B.C. 1171, according to the Bible chronology. His father Elkanah was an inhabitant of Ramath-Zophim in the tribe of Ephraim, and his mother's name was Hannah. It appears from Samuel's genealogy that he was a Levite by descent, of the family of the Kohathites, 1 Sam. i. 1; 1 Chron. vi. 33; nevertheless it has been disputed whether Samuel was a priest, and those who deny it allege that persons who were not priests wore the ephod, offered sacrifices in extraordinary cases, and consecrated kings. This to a limited extent is undoubted, for though the ephod was unquestionably a sacerdotal garment, it was not exclusively confined to the priests. Elkanah had two wives—Hannah, already mentioned, and Peninnah, the latter of whom had children, but the former had continued barren. Hannah seems to have been his first wife, and when she proved barren his anxiety to have children induced him to take another, as Abraham had done by Sarah's consent. This practice was in conformity to the peculiar usages of those early times, and it is not abrogated at the present day by the Orientals. The circumstances connected with the pregnancy of Hannah and the birth of Samuel her only son are narrated by him in the first chapter of the Book which bears his name. He was devoted to God from the womb, and his pious mother looked upon him as the child of her earnest prayers and supplications. "For this child," she said to Eli the high priest, "I prayed, and the Lord hath given me my petition which I asked of him; therefore also I have lent (or *given*) him to the Lord; as long as he liveth he shall be lent (or *given*) unto the Lord." At the birth of a son so eminent and distinguished Hannah celebrated the event in an inspired and prophetic hymn, which, says Dr Hales, "excels in simplicity of composition, closeness of connection, and uniformity of sentiment, breathing the

pious effusions of a devout mind deeply impressed with a conviction of God's mercies to herself in particular, and of his providential government of the world in general—in exalting the poor in spirit, or the humble-minded, and abasing the rich and arrogant—rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked. Hannah was a prophetess of the first class. Besides predicting her own fruitfulness, she foretels not only the more immediate judgments of God on the Philistines during her son's administration, but his remoter judgments on the *ends of the earth*, in the true spirit of the prophecies of Jacob, Balaam, and Moses. Like them she describes the promised Saviour of the world as a *King*, before there was any king in Israel, and she first applied to him the remarkable epithet *Messiah* in Hebrew, *Christ* in Greek, and *Anointed* in English, which was adopted by all the succeeding prophets of the Old Testament, and by the apostles and prophets of the New."

Nothing is recorded of the infancy and youth of Samuel farther than the general statements in fulfilment of his mother's vow of dedication to the service of God, that "the child did minister unto the Lord before Eli the priest," "girded with a linen ephod," and "the child Samuel grew before the Lord," and "was in favour both with the Lord, and also with men." His mother bore other three sons and two daughters, and "Eli blessed Elkanah and his wife, and said, The Lord give thee seed of this woman for the loan which is lent unto the Lord," or the *gift* which is *given* according to the terms of Hannah's petition.

The profligacy of Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli the high priest, provoked the Divine vengeance, and affords an awful example of the punishment which awaits unprincipled and irreligious members of the altar—of those who by their conduct say, as it was intimated to the too indulgent father of those unhappy servants of the sanctuary—"Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priests' offices, that I may eat a piece of bread."—More directly this seems to have been literally

fulfilled in the case of Abiathar, who was not only deposed from his office, but deprived of the portion given to the priests in the Temple, 1 Kings ii. 26, 27, and by this means, as Bishop Patrick observes, his posterity "fell into extreme want, in which the just judgment of God may be observed that the children of those who were so wanton that they could not be content unless they had the choicest part of the sacrifice should fall into so low a condition as to beg their bread."

We are told that "Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli. And the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision." This probably means that there was no public manifestation of the Divine Presence, or that no one was acknowledged to be a prophet, unto whom the people could resort to know the purposes of the Deity. The high priest Eli was far advanced in years, and his "eyes began to wax dim, that he could not see." The Hebrew chronology dates the first Divine revelation to Samuel about B. C. 1141, when Eli was in the feeble condition described by the inspired writer. There were various rooms in the court of the tabernacle for the uses of the priests; and Eli had lain down for repose in one of them when a voice called Samuel, who answered, "Here am I," and went to Eli to receive his commands, concluding that he was the person who had spoken to him. Eli told him that he had not called, and that he must be altogether mistaken. The mysterious voice again audibly exclaimed, "Samuel," who went to Eli, and insisted that he had called him this time. The high priest assured him that he had not uttered a word, and advised him to lie down. It is stated that at this particular time "Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed to him," which simply means that he had not hitherto been invested with his divine commission. The voice a third time summoned Samuel, and Eli now saw that the call proceeded from God. He said to Samuel—"Go, lie down; and it shall be, if He call thee, that thou shalt say,

Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." Samuel obeyed, and the result was as Eli had intimated. But that mysterious voice announced the most summary vengeance against the family of Eli, who is denounced for his parental conduct—"his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not," or, as it is expressed in the margin, "frowned not upon them." Samuel, who held the high priest in the greatest veneration, felt reluctant to disclose to him the "vision," but after a solemn adjuration, he told Eli "every whit, and hid nothing from him." The aged high priest heard the fate of his family with unmoved patience and humble submission. He calmly replied—"It is the Lord; let him do what seemeth him good."

This and other divine revelations were made to Samuel at Shiloh, and "all Israel, from Dan even to Beersheba, knew that he was established to be a prophet of the Lord." Shortly afterwards the Philistines defeated the Israelites on two several occasions, when the latter lost in all thirty-four thousand men. The ark of God was also taken, and Hophni and Phinehas, the two profligate sons of Eli, were also slain. A messenger from the defeated army proceeded to Shiloh with the intelligence, and intimated to Eli the death of his sons, but that did not so much affect him as the information that the ark of God had been taken by the uncircumcised Philistines. No sooner was this communicated to him than he "fell from off the seat backward by the side of the gate, and his neck brake, and he died." The administration of Eli continued forty years, and at the death of this high priest Samuel was acknowledged judge and governor of Israel. The Philistines were obliged to send back the ark, and the circumstances connected with its transmission are minutely recorded. The Israelites, by the persuasion^o of Samuel, solemnly repented of their idolatry, and gained a signal victory over their enemies, which he commemorated by setting up a stone between Mizpah and Shen, calling it *Ebenezer*, or *the stone of help*.

The administration of Samuel was conducted on impartial and just principles. His own residence was at Ramah, supposed to be the Arimatea of the New Testament, and he "went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpah, and judged Israel in all those places." Some think that the practice of judges, as in this country, going in circuit every year, or oftener, to administer justice, was derived from this practice of Samuel, but there is in reality little or no resemblance, for Samuel did not itinerate. All the towns mentioned were within a short distance of each other, and were all within the territorial limits of the tribe of Benjamin.

Towards the close of his life he appointed his sons, Joel and Abiah, to the subordinate office of judges, but they "walked not in his ways, they turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment." Their conduct irritated the Israelites, and they applied to Samuel to appoint a king over them. This request grieved Samuel, who saw in it a departure from the original principles of the theocracy, but he was commanded by Jehovah to comply. He convened the elders of Israel, and predicted to them what they would suffer under the government of an arbitrary monarch, who would treat them as slaves rather than as subjects, and would hold at his disposal their persons, property, time, and labour. He told them that God granted their request, not because He approved of it, but because it would become the medium of their punishment, and that He would not hear them when they would complain of the tyranny of their kings, but that He would leave them to continue under the yoke of regal despotism. The Israelites, however, refused to act by the advice of Samuel. They persisted in their request, saying—"We will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles."

Various causes of national misfortune were in operation at the time of Samuel,

among which may be mentioned the effeminacy and cowardice of the people, and the disunion and jealousy of the tribes, who never assisted each other with the requisite zeal and alacrity. Their effeminacy resulted from the vices of idolatry, and their cowardice from a want of confidence in Jehovah, while their disunion and jealousy, more immediately originating in selfishness, also resulted from a disposition not to consider themselves as the united and only people of their invisible King, Jehovah. These causes of national misfortune threatened to produce great calamities after the death of Samuel. "The tribes beyond the Jordan," observes Professor Jahn, "had formidable enemies in the Ammonites, and the southern tribes in the Philistines, while the northern tribes stood aloof from the dangers of their more exposed countrymen. The latter seems to have been the principal reason why the rulers in general assembly requested a king. The tribes in southern Palestine and beyond the Jordan were most earnest for this change in the government. They feared the death of Samuel would leave them without a supreme magistrate, and, the nation being again disunited, they should be left to their fate. The degeneracy of Samuel's sons, who had been appointed subordinate judges or deputies, increased their apprehensions, and they therefore strenuously insisted on their demand. They had reason to hope that a king, invested with supreme authority, might be able to unite the power of the whole nation, and protect each tribe with the collected strength of all—that under him the affairs of government would be more promptly administered, and necessary aid more readily afforded—that if he were a man devoted to Jehovah, he could more effectually suppress or prevent idolatry, and thus place the welfare of the state on a more solid foundation. They might imagine themselves justified in this request, as Moses had taken it for granted that the nation would eventually have a king, and the same thing had been promised to their great

progenitor Abraham. It conduces not a little to the honour of the Hebrews that they attempted this change in their constitution, not by their own power, but in accordance with the principles of theocracy. They requested it from their King, Jehovah, by the intervention of a prophet, and they effected it without bloodshed—a manifest proof that the time of the Judges was neither a barbarous nor a heroic age. But as the invisible King Jehovah would necessarily be obscured by a subordinate visible monarch, He, by means of Samuel, gave the rulers to understand his disapprobation of their request, and at the same time briefly represented the burdens they would have to bear under a king, especially how easily he might be induced to imitate the other Oriental monarchs, and disregard the law of Jehovah. As they, notwithstanding, persisted in their demand, it was granted them, probably because the desired change was requested from the invisible King in a lawful manner, through the mediation of his prophet, and because, in the present disposition of the nation, it might be effected without bloodshed. If the remark of Polybius is true, that all aristocracies and democracies terminate at last in monarchy, this change must have taken place at some future time, and perhaps might have been attended with civil war. By this alteration of the constitution, the theocracy was indeed thrown somewhat into the shade, as it was no longer clearly manifest that God was the King of the Hebrews. Still, however, as the principles of theocracy were interwoven with the fundamental and unchangeable law of the state, their influence did not entirely cease, but the elected king was to act as the viceroy and vassal of Jehovah. On this account Moses had already established the following regulations (Deut. xvii. 14-20):—1. That the Hebrews, whenever they adopted the monarchical form of government, should raise those only to the throne who were chosen by Jehovah himself. As monarchs, called *kings of kings*, were accustomed to ap-

point sub-kings or viceroys in the several provinces of their dominions, so was the king of the Hebrews to be called to the throne by Jehovah, to receive the kingdom from Him, and to consider himself in all respects as His representative, vassal, and viceroy. On this occasion the will of Jehovah was to be made known by a prophet, or by means of the sacred lot Urim and Thummim, and the viceroy elect was to prove himself an instrument of God by protecting the commonwealth against its foes. The succession of the royal house was to depend on the will of God, to be made known by his prophets. Saul, David, and Jeroboam, received the promise of the throne from the prophets; by them was foretold the succession of the family of David, and of the other families in the kingdom of Israel; and these divine interpositions were well calculated to remind the kings of Him on whom they were dependent, and to whose choice they were indebted for the throne. 2. Moses had likewise ordained that the king should be a native Israelite. Foreigners were thus excluded from the throne, even though they should be proposed by false prophets, for, being heathens, they might transgress the fundamental law of the state by the introduction of idolatry, or at least it would have been difficult for them to rule in all respects as the vassals of Jehovah. This regulation had reference merely to free elections, and was by no means to be understood as it was explained by Judas Galileus and the Zealots, during the last war with the Romans, that the Hebrews were not to submit to those foreign powers under whose dominion they were brought by an all-directing Providence. On the contrary, Moses himself had predicted such events, and Jeremiah and Ezekiel earnestly exhorted their countrymen to surrender quietly to the Chaldeans."

Saul was appointed by Jehovah to be the first king of the Israelites, about the year B. C. 1096, and his elevation was privately announced to him by Samuel, who did homage to him. The Prophet

"took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, saying, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?" He then gave him some particular directions, but Saul concealed his appointment from his relatives. Samuel convened a general assembly of the tribes at Mizpeh, at which it was resolved to choose the king by lot, or by Urim and Thummim, and in this manner to submit the choice to God as the supreme Ruler. As Samuel predicted, Saul was chosen, and the Prophet said to the people—"See ye whom the Lord hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people?" The assemblage responded to this announcement—"God save the king," or, as it is in the marginal reading,—“Let the king live.” The people immediately dispersed, “every man to his own house.”

Saul was not established in the kingdom, or generally acknowledged, until he had delivered the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead from the Ammonites. He then received the homage of all the Israelites at Gilgal, who were so enthusiastic in their demonstrations of loyalty, that they threatened to put to death any one who disputed his appointment to the throne. On this occasion Samuel addressed them in the most energetic language, asserting the impartiality of his administration previous to the elevation of Saul, and resigning his office with a clear conscience and unblemished reputation. Dr Hales thus forcibly gives the substance of the distinguished Prophet's speech:—"He first challenges the Israelites to adduce any instance of oppression, fraud, or bribery, on his part while he judged Israel, that he and his sons both stood before the tribunal of the public, ready to await their sentence; and when the people expressly acknowledged his integrity, he then reminded them of the servitudes they had incurred for forgetting or forsaking God, and the deliverers whom God, on their repentance, occasionally raised up to them. He concluded by threatening them with the divine chastisements upon them, and the king whom

the Lord had granted to them, if they rebelled any more against Him; and to mark the divine displeasure at their proceedings, and also his own power with God, he called down thunder and rain from heaven at the unusual season of wheat-harvest. And when all the people besought him to intercede for them that their lives might be spared, he kindly encouraged them to trust in the Lord, notwithstanding this additional crime of asking a king, and he still assured them of his intercession in their behalf, and of his services as their civil judge and teacher. This illustrious prophet, like his predecessor Moses, was mighty to intercede for his backsliding people, and has placed the duty of public intercession on its firmest basis, as also the sin incurred by neglecting it on the part of the ministers of religion, and of the guardians of the state."

The actions of Samuel now become intimately connected with those of Saul, a sketch of whose remarkable history follows the present article. It may be simply mentioned, that the last authoritative act of Samuel was that of anointing David, and investing him with the royal authority, to the exclusion of Saul and his family. After this he retired to his native town of Ramah, where he resided till his death, associating with the prophets, who formed a kind of community under his superintendence. He died about two years before Saul, in the ninety-eighth year of his age, and was buried at Ramah. His body is traditionally said to have been taken to Constantinople in the time of the Emperor Arcadius, and in the Roman Martyrology his festival is appointed to be celebrated on the 20th of August.

Samuel is supposed to be the author of the Books of Judges and Ruth, and of the First of the two Books which bear his name. Respecting the latter, there can be little doubt that he wrote the first twenty-four chapters, which are a narrative of his own history and transactions, though they abound in particulars which must have been added after his death. The Talmudists accordingly maintain that the remainder of the First Book

was written by the prophets Nathan and Gad, and they cite for their authority a passage from the First Book of the Chronicles (1 Chron. xxix. 29). The First Book of Samuel comprehends the events which occurred under the government of Eli the high priest, Samuel, and Saul. The Second Book is the History of David's reign. The two Books of the Kings contain the history of Solomon, and the reigns of the several kings of Israel and Judah to the destruction of the Ten Tribes, and the Captivity of Judah. This portion of the inspired record embraces altogether a history of about six hundred years. Samuel began that succession of illustrious Prophets which continued to the times of Zechariah and Malachi.

"How singular," says Dr Delaney, "was the character and piety of Samuel—devoted to God from the womb, and worthy to be so—early dedicated to the Deity, and hallowed by His influence—descended from prophets, himself a greater! The service of God made the early business of his life, and it was never interrupted by any thing but the service of his country. Exalted to supremepower, without ambition; exerting it without oppression or avarice, and resigning it without reluctance when his God commanded him! Illustrious in the splendour of a throne, and yet more so in the shade of a cell—so far from envying his successor to the supreme power, that he pitied and prayed for him. He lived to the noblest purposes—the glory of God and the good of his country, and he died full of years and honours, universally lamented. Such was Samuel—and such always were, and always will be, in a great measure, those whose beginnings are laid in true religion, whose duty is their delight, and God their glory."

SAUL, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, is distinguished in sacred history as the first king of the Israelites. The events of his life are so intimately connected with those of Samuel and David, that any minute account of him would be little short of a repetition of much

which is stated in the preceding article, and in another portion of this work (see DAVID). Saul belonged to a family of the tribe of Benjamin celebrated for their valour, but as an individual he was far from aspiring to the sovereignty of the Israelites. The inspired historian informs us that he was a "choice young man, and a goodly; and there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he; from his shoulders and upwards he was higher than any of the people." This latter statement refers to the gigantic stature of Saul, and the whole passage intimates his bodily strength and prowess, for his family were not distinguished by their rank or wealth, and we find him confessing that they were "the least of all the families of Benjamin." At the time of his selection for the regal dignity his father had sent him with a servant in search of some of his asses which had strayed or been stolen, and he "passed through Mount Ephraim, and passed through the land of Shalisha, but they found them not; then they passed through the land of Shalim, and there they were not, and he passed through the land of the Benjamites, but they found them not." From this specific notice it appears that the animals had been carried off in some predatory incursion, and Saul, finding his search useless, resolved to return, "lest his father, leaving care of the asses," would "take thought" of him. He was then searching a district of the tribe of Ephraim called the land of Zuph, where Samuel's ancestors had resided, and in which the Prophet's natal town of Ramah was situated. When approaching that place Saul's confidential servant said to him—"Behold now, there is in this city a man of God, and he is an honourable man; all that he saith cometh surely to pass; now let us go thither; peradventure he can show us our way that we should go." The "man of God" here mentioned was the Prophet Samuel, and it appears that they either did not know well where they were, or that they were inclined to apply to Samuel as a last resort respecting the recovery of the

—animals of great value and importance in the East. Saul replied—"But behold, if we go, what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent in our vessels, and there is not a present to bring to the man of God: what have we?"

Here we have a fine intimation of Oriental customs. Bruce informs us that presents to men of rank or eminence are essential to civil and ordinary intercourse in the East—"whether they consist of dates or of diamonds, they form so customary a part of Eastern manners, that without them an inferior will never be at peace in his own mind, or think that he has hold of his superior for protection." Maundrell tells us that he "visited no bashaw or great person without this previous respect, as it was (is) accounted uncivil in those countries to make such a visit without an offering in hand. All such persons expect it as a tribute due to their character, and deeming themselves affronted, and even defrauded, when this compliment is omitted. Even in familiar visits among inferior people, you seldom observe them coming without bringing some flowers, or oranges, or other token of respect, to the person visited. The Turks in this respect keep up the ancient Oriental custom hinted in 1 Sam. ix. 7, which is to be understood in conformity to this usage, as denoting a token of respect, and not a price of divination." Many similar testimonies might be given of a practice which prevails considerably in our own country among mutual friends and relatives; but in the East the custom is national and universal. Mr Morier informs us, that in Persia the "charge of a present is frequently made the matter of a bargain among the adherents of the donor, and sometimes is purchased directly from the great man himself.—The wretched traffic of presents places the Persian character in a very unfavourable light. The meannesses and obligations to which they will submit for the sake of a present, and their jealousies and anxieties about its amount, are at least very ridiculous." It may be here observed, that as the

custom of presents from an inferior to a superior is universal in the East, when an interview is desired or a favour asked, in like manner to refuse the humblest offering is no less an incivility and insult to the person by whom it is offered, than it is to approach the presence of a superior without the usual mark of respect.

These explanations of Oriental customs are necessary, otherwise the passages of Scripture in which they are mentioned cannot be properly understood; and in the present case, without such a reference, the reader would be apt to regard Saul and his servant as very silly persons, or infer that Samuel was very rapacious. The very reverse is the case; and the prominent points in the custom now explained are, that Saul would have given some victuals to Samuel if any had been left; but having none, it was deemed necessary to offer money. In reply to Saul's statement respecting their want of any suitable provision, his servant said—"Behold, I have here at hand the fourth part of a shekel of silver; that will I give to the man of God, to tell us our way." Saul conceded, with the suggestion—"Well said; come, let us go;" and they "went unto the city where the man of God was." Here, again, some explanatory observations may with propriety be made. It was first, as already observed, Saul's intention to present Samuel with something edible; and it is remarkable that at the present time in the East articles of provision are the usual presents which the rural population offer to their patrons and superiors. A merchant gives something from the commodities in which he traffics, and an artisan from the products of his skill. The person who receives these presents may not require them for his own use or for that of his family, but he expects them. Mr Morier tells us that on a certain occasion in Persia—"we were ushered into an apartment where a large service of sweetmeats and fruits was prepared for us. Here we sat until we had despatched the usual forms of a visit with the *grandees* who had met us and

accompanied us thus far. The remaining part of the day was occupied in receiving other less noble visitants, and in accepting the countless presents which were sent from various parts, and which consisted for the most part of live lambs, fruits, and sweetmeats. The store of sweetmeats at last became so great, that they were distributed amongst our numerous servants, troopers, and *feroshes*." Saul, having no provisions, resolved to present the "fourth part of a shekel"—a sum of about sevenpence of our money, but the smallness of the sum did not render it contemptible or indecorous, for money is preferred to offerings of provisions, and is usually given by those who have no particular profession or pursuit. A sixpence from a poor person requesting a favour or an interview is quite as acceptable as a basket of fruit which a sixpence would purchase, and travellers in the East are often astonished at the smallness of the sum which a very great man is satisfied to receive. Mr Morier mentions one Aga Mahomed Ali, a servant of one of the royal princes of Persia, who received for himself from the British envoy a present of five hundred piastres. "The great men," he adds, "profit by these opportunities of enriching, by such returns, any servant to whom in their own persons they may owe an obligation, and to whom they thus cheaply to themselves repay it."

A parenthetical clause interrupts this part of the inspired narrative (1 Sam. ix. 9), which has no connection with what precedes it, and which ought to be placed after the 11th verse. "(Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come, and let us go to the seer; for he that is now called a prophet was beforetime called a seer.)" The meaning of this parenthetical verse is, that at the time when Saul was appointed king, the Hebrew word *roek*, or a *seer of secret things*, was usually applied to inspired persons, but that the word *nabi*, or *prophet*, had come into common use. The word *nabi* was indeed early used to designate a prophet

(Gen. xx. 7), but it then implied simply a man favoured of God, whereas in the time of Samuel it designated a person who foresaw future events. In the *Fragments to Calmet* it is observed—"It is remarkable that the title *seer* occurs principally, if not altogether, under the regal government of Israel; the first time we meet with it being in this passage with reference to the Prophet Samuel."

When Saul and his servant approached Ramah, which the text states was situated on a hill, they met some young women going to the vicinity to draw water—another intimation of an ancient Oriental custom. Saul inquired at these young women—"Is the seer here?" Their reply was—"He is; behold, he is before you: make haste now, for he came to-day to the city, for there is a sacrifice of the people to-day in the high place. As soon as ye come into the city, ye shall straightway find him, before ye go up to the high place to eat; for the people will not eat until he come, because he doth bless the sacrifice, and afterwards they eat that he bidden. Now therefore get you up, for about this time ye shall find him." This passage also contains some important allusions to Oriental customs, on which it is impossible to enter in the present work. It may be briefly stated, that some solemn festival is intimated, or at least a special occasion of prayer and thanksgiving. Samuel was to "bless the sacrifice," namely, the *feast after the sacrifice*, because the greater part of what was offered belonged to him who made the offering, and on this he entertained his friends; and the expression alludes to the custom common among the Hebrews, and evidently derived from them, of giving thanks before meals. The intimation of the *high place* in the text is remarkable as being the first instance of any belonging to the chosen people: and it is the opinion of some learned commentators that, as it must have been a private place of worship, it originated the institution of synagogues in subsequent times.

Saul and his servant entered Ramah, and met Samuel going to the "high place"

to bless the sacrifice. The Prophet had been previously instructed by a Divine communication in what way he was to act, and was informed who Saul was, and the will of Jehovah respecting his appointment to be king. Saul, however, was unacquainted with Samuel, and he accosted him—"Tell me, I pray thee, where the seer's house is." Samuel answered—"I am the seer; go up before me unto the high place, for ye shall eat with me to-day, and to-morrow I will let thee go, and will tell thee all that is in thine heart. And as for thine asses that were lost three days ago, set not thy mind upon them. And on whom is all the desire of Israel? Is it not on thee, and on all thy father's house?" Astonished at being addressed by a person of such importance as the seer in this manner, Saul answered—"Am not I a Benjamite, of the smallest of all the tribes of Israel? and my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin? wherefore then speakest thou so to me?" Samuel's reply is not recorded, but he brought Saul and his servant into an apartment, and assigned them the chief place among thirty guests whom he had invited. The Prophet told his domestic to place the shoulder of the lamb before Saul—an intimation of an ancient and still existing custom in the East, of distinguishing at table the person whom the host intends to honour, by the quantity or choice of the victuals set before him. In the text the shoulder seems to have been considered the distinguishing part of the entertainment, and in the East the shoulder of a lamb is esteemed a peculiar delicacy. Josephus says it was called the *royal portion*. After the entertainment Samuel "communed" with Saul "upon the top of the house." This is also illustrative of Eastern manners, of which we have many intimations in the Scriptures, and many illustrations in the practice of the present time. Samuel conversed with Saul for coolness on the house-top in the evening. Saul slept there during the night, and he was called by the Prophet in the morning. Mr

Morier tells us that in Persia "at night all sleep on the tops of the houses, their beds being spread upon their terraces, without any other covering over their heads than the vault of heaven. This universal custom of sleeping on the house-top speaks much in favour of the climate of Persia, and indeed we found that our repose in the open air was much more refreshing than the confinement of a room. That this was a Jewish custom may be inferred from the passage where it is said, that in an 'evening-tide' David arose from off his bed, and walked upon the roof of the king's house."

Early in the morning the Prophet summoned Saul from his repose, and accompanied him without the city. At his request Saul's servant was ordered to "pass on" before them, while he showed Saul the "word of the Lord." The transaction which now took place was evidently private. He anointed Saul with oil, pouring it upon his head, and kissed him, saying, "Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?" This was about the year B.C. 1095, and although we read of no specific command for the ceremonial of anointing, it is clear from the parable of Jotham, recorded in the Book of Judges (ix. 8), that it was a custom known two centuries before this time. The Prophet then told Saul that his father's asses were found, and that his own safety was now the great object of parental solicitude and anxiety. To confirm the truth of what he had done and said, the Prophet farther told him what would befall him in the way home to his father in several instances, and that at a particular place he would meet a "company of prophets coming down from the high place, with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, before them, and they shall prophesy." He added—"The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man. And let it be when these signs are come unto thee, that thou shalt do as occasion serve thee, for God is with thee, and thou shalt go down before me unto Gilgal; and

behold, I will come down unto thee, to offer burnt-offerings and to sacrifice sacrifices of peace-offerings; seven days shalt thou tarry till I come to thee, and show thee what thou shalt do."

Everything which Samuel announced to Saul happened, and the appearance of the latter amongst the prophets excited the astonishment of the people, who exclaimed—"What is this that is come unto the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?" The inspired historian informs us that this latter exclamation afterwards became proverbial. A person present said, in answer to the question,—"But who is their father?" This was intimation to those who were surprised at seeing Saul among the prophets, to consider that neither men nor education merely could make prophets, but God alone, who could impart the spirit of prophecy to any one whom He pleased. Saul now came to his uncle, who inquired where he had been sojourning, and the cause of his absence. The reply was—"To seek the asses, and when we saw that they were nowhere we came to Samuel." Saul's uncle was anxious to know what had passed between the prophet and his nephew, but the latter chose to tell him no more than that he had been assured that the asses had been found, but "of the matter of the kingdom, whereof Samuel spake, he told him not." This prudent reserve was necessary, for though Saul had been anointed by Samuel, that act was, as Jahn observes, only a "prophetic symbol or intimation that persons so anointed would certainly govern the kingdom," and we know that he did not become king till some time after this anointing, when the new monarchy was renewed at Gilgal. David, though anointed in Saul's lifetime, did not at all pretend to the kingly dignity on any occasion while Saul lived, nor afterwards, till first the tribe of Judah, and, seven years after that event, the other tribes, called him to the throne. It appears, indeed, from the historical books of the Scriptures, that no king at any period alleged a right to the throne be-

cause he had been anointed by a prophet, and that the people did not think themselves bound to nominate him in consequence of that act, but the knowledge that he *had been* anointed had the prophetic effect of directing the attention of the people towards him, as one who would some time or other be their king. The other anointing, which took place after the new king had been recognised by the people, formed the actual inauguration ceremony, and this was done by the high priest, probably with the holy anointing oil.

It is worthy of observation, as Dr Hales observes, that the "Spirit of the Lord which came upon Saul, and turned him into *another man*," as foretold by Samuel, did not in the least interfere with his free will or free agency. He was still to act as "*occasion should serve*" or require; and we accordingly find that when his relative wanted him to tell what had passed between him and the Prophet he mentioned the information he had received respecting the asses, but he concealed the important matter of his appointment to be king. He followed the dictates of his own prudence on this occasion, as he did afterwards when he was insulted by the seditious, and "held his peace;" but he was still at liberty to "grieve" and even to "quench the Spirit," and, on the contrary, to be possessed with an *evil spirit* when he lost those qualities which first recommended him, and became jealous and tyrannical.

Samuel convened the Israelites at Mizpeh, and reminded them of all the circumstances connected with their peremptory request for a king to reign over them, and ordered them to "present themselves before the Lord by their tribes, and by thousands." The selection of the tribe from which the king was to be taken was made, which was done by the sacred lot, and the choice fell on the tribe of Benjamin. Having thus shown the divine will to the people, all the other tribes were put aside, and that of Benjamin was analyzed by families. The sacred lot fell on the family of Matri, to

which Saul belonged, and lastly the lot fell on Saul himself. All this was done in the most public manner, that the people might have no excuse for discontent at any subsequent period. Saul appears not to have been present, but he was soon brought from his place of concealment, and Samuel said to all the people, that he was the person sanctioned by Jehovah to be their king, an intimation received amid general acclamations. The Prophet then "told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord," after which the assembly dispersed. According to Josephus, Samuel in this document recorded the evils which were to befall the Israelites for rejecting God, who had "saved them himself out of all their adversities and tribulations," and demanding a temporal sovereign, and he laid it up in the tabernacle as a memorial of the truth of his predictions. This view of the matter, however, is very improbable, and it is more likely that he either recorded the solemn election of Saul, or, as some farther contend, he committed to writing those rules and principles according to which the new king was to govern.

The personal appearance of Saul was greatly in his favour, at least it was not in the estimation of the Hebrews a matter of indifference. We are told that he was "higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward." The Israelites participated in that notion which we find prevailing every where in the early history of nations, that height of stature and accomplishment of person formed one of the principal recommendations to honour, and antiquity abounds with exhibitions of the same kind of feeling. In the Oriental sculptures the kings are usually distinguished by their size and stature from other persons represented, and though it does not follow that they were all actually so, it proves that ideas of dignity were associated with colossal proportions. Homer represents the Grecian chiefs as of gigantic stature, and Herodotus mentions an Ethiopian nation who always elected to

the sovereign power the person most distinguished for stature and proportionate strength. Much of this feeling evidently pervaded the Israelites on the present occasion, and even Samuel himself; for when he was subsequently sent to anoint one of Jesse's sons, the fine appearance of Eliab made the prophet conclude that *he* must be the destined king of Israel, but he was corrected by Jehovah in these impressive words—"Look not on his countenance, or on the *height of his stature*, for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; *for man looketh on the outward appearance*, but the Lord looketh on the heart."

But Saul was compelled to encounter some opposition to his regal appointment, and it is stated that certain "children of Belial," men who had no regard to the Divine sanction, who hated any kind of regular government, or were irritated at seeing one so comparatively obscure as Saul elevated to be king—exclaimed in contempt—"How shall this man reign over us?" They would not recognise Saul as their sovereign, and consequently "brought him no presents." Saul prudently took no notice of their conduct, but proceeded to his own residence at Gibeah, situated in his native tribe of Benjamin, and sometimes called *Gibeah of Saul*. He was attended thither by a body of zealous followers, whose "hearts God had touched." At this time Nahash the Ammonite marched against Jabesh-Gilead, east of the Jordan, in the territory of the half-tribe of Manasseh. The inhabitants, terrified at the fate which seemed to await them from those rude nomades, attempted to gain as favourable terms as possible, but Nahash positively declared to them—"On this condition will I make a covenant with you, that I may thrust out all your right eyes, and lay it for a reproach upon all Israel." The citizens requested a cessation of hostilities for seven days, that they might use every exertion to avert this hard fate, and promising that if there was "no man to save" them they would submit. They sent messengers to the residence of Saul at Gibeah, and con-

vened an assembly of the people, to whom they related all the circumstances of the disaster with which they were threatened. The assembly could do little more than sympathize with the unfortunate deputies from Jabesh-Gilead—they “lifted up their voices, and wept.” While thus expressing their sorrow Saul joined them. He “came after the herd out of the field,” from which it appears that he still occupied himself in his former rural occupations, exercising no authority individually, but leaving the government to the administration of Samuel. When he was informed of the cause of this great demonstration of grief the “Spirit of God came upon him,” and “his anger was kindled greatly.” We are told that “he took a yoke of oxen, and hewed them in pieces, and sent them throughout all the coasts of Israel by the hands of messengers, saying, Whosoever cometh not after Saul and after Samuel, so shall it be done unto his oxen. And the fear of the Lord fell on the people, and they came out with one consent.” In this case he exercised the first act of his authority, which had not been recognised by the “children of Belial,” and evinced his determined resolution to punish, with the loss of their cattle, those who would not support him. The principle of this ancient custom, which conveyed a peculiarly awful threat to a people almost entirely occupied in agricultural and pastoral pursuits, is easily understood; and his threat had the desired effect. No fewer than 30,000 of the tribe of Judah, and 300,000 of the other tribes, assembled at Bezek in the great plain of Esdraelon, and nearly opposite to Jabesh-Gilead. Saul put himself at their head, and marched to the relief of the place. He defeated the Ammonites, who suffered a severe loss, and were so completely scattered that “two of them were not left together.” The heroic conduct of Saul on this occasion so endeared him to the people, that they expressed a wish to put to death all those who refused to acknowledge his authority, especially those who had con-

temptuously exclaimed, “Shall Saul reign over us?” The king, however, positively refused to allow this retaliation, saying, “There shall not a man be put to death this day, for to-day the Lord hath wrought salvation in Israel.” A great convocation of the tribes was soon afterwards held at Gilgal at which Samuel presided, and Saul was solemnly ratified and established on the throne. They here made him “king before the Lord;” and “they sacrificed sacrifices of peace-offerings before the Lord, and there Saul and all the men of Israel rejoiced greatly.” At this renewed election of the king, the “continuance of the theocracy,” says Professor Jahn, “was earnestly insisted on by Samuel; and he also declared that the Hebrews would be prosperous if they and their king worshipped Jehovah, and obeyed his injunctions, and if not, Jehovah would be an enemy to them and to their king.”

We are told that “Saul reigned one year, and when he had reigned two years over Israel, Saul chose him three thousand men of Israel, whereof two thousand were with Saul in Michmash and in Mount Bethel, and a thousand were with Jonathan in Gibeah of Benjamin, and the rest of the people he sent every man to his tent.” Commentators are much divided respecting the meaning of the first clause of this passage. In the original there is nothing about reigning, and it is literally, *Saul was the son of a year*—a Hebrew idiom for intimating the age of a person; and it is inferred that the first clause expresses his age, while the second states the time he had reigned, but the word expressing his age has been lost. Some writers insert *thirty*—others think that he was forty years of age at the time of his election; and Dr Hales observes that he could not have been much younger, for we find his son Jonathan holding a separate military command, and successfully attacking the Philistine garrison in Geba. As soon as the Philistines heard of this disaster they “gathered themselves together to fight with Israel, thirty thousand chariots, and six thousand horsemen, and people as the

sand which is on the sea-shore in multitude; and they came up, and pitched in Michmash, eastward from Beth-aven." The expression, *they came up*, refers to the position of the country occupied by the Philistines, which consisted of the line of coast of Canaan stretching along the Mediterranean, while the Israelites occupied the interior. It is difficult to assign the position of Beth-aven, mentioned as "eastward from Michmash." The Septuagint reads *Bethoron*, and the Syriac and Arabic render it *Beth-el*, which concurs with the text of our version, for Beth-aven was a little eastward of Beth-el. Some difficulties also occur with reference to the immense army said to have been sent by the Philistines on this occasion, and it is generally admitted that the text conveys an erroneous impression, but there are different opinions as to the correct understanding. If two horses and two men are allowed to each chariot, there must have been sixty thousand for the chariots alone, while the horsemen are stated at only six thousand, yet it is well known that the proportion of cavalry in the ancient armies was greatly superior to the chariots. Such a number of chariots, or any number approaching to it, is totally unknown in all the statements of the great armies raised by the most powerful monarchs of the East, and it is utterly impossible that the small states of the Philistines could furnish what the whole of Asia could not supply. Some contend that the number in the text is right, but that it comprehends carriages of all descriptions as well as war chariots; and others consider that the statement *thirty thousand* refers rather to the men fighting in the chariots than to the chariots themselves, the word being sometimes used in that sense. Some adopt the Syrian and Arabic reading of *three thousand*, and others, again, thinking this number still too large, incorporate the conclusion already stated, and suppose that it either includes vehicles of all descriptions, or that we are to understand *three thousand* men fighting in a smaller number of chariots.

The Hebrews saw this invasion with dismay, and concealed themselves "in caves, and in thickets, and in rocks, and in high places, and in pits." Some fled to the territory of the Gadites and the country of Gilead on the other side of the Jordan, and others followed Saul "trembling" to Gilgal, where he still remained. He was detained there by the command of Samuel when he anointed him, who had directed him to wait for him seven days at Gilgal, and then to act by his direction. He waited for the Prophet till the morning of the appointed time, but Samuel did not make his appearance, and as the people were impatient and panic-struck, Saul proceeded to cause the burnt-offering to be celebrated. No sooner had it been concluded than Samuel came, and notwithstanding the apparently reasonable reply of Saul, he severely reproved him for offering the sacrifice in the manner he did, as if acting on his own responsibility—for not waiting till the end of the seventh day—and for intending to begin the war without any direction from himself. The Prophet cut short all Saul's excuses by a declaration to which the conscience of the king could not withstand—"Thou hast done foolishly; thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord thy God which he commanded thee, for now would the Lord have established thy kingdom for ever." This rendering *for ever* cannot be understood literally, but must mean *for a long time*, or as *long as his posterity or descendants remained*, for the prophecy of Jacob expressly promised the sceptre to the tribe of Judah. The Prophet followed up his reproof of Saul in this conclusive manner—"But now thy kingdom shall not continue; the Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over his people, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee."

Saul found himself at the head of only six hundred men at his native place of Gibeah, while the Philistines still lay encamped at Michmash. The invaders

sent out three strong parties in different directions to lay waste the country, and there is little doubt that they did considerable damage. The inspired historian gives us a remarkable proof of the miserable condition to which the tyranny of the Philistines had reduced the Israelites. "Now there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel, for the Philistines said, Lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears. But all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock. Yet they had a file for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks, and for the axes, and to sharpen the goads." We are not to understand that the Israelites went to the *country* of the Philistines, to have their agricultural implements sharpened, but that they repaired to the military stations which that people had established among them, and where probably the Hebrew smiths worked under the eyes of their oppressors. This kind of policy was followed in subsequent times by the Chaldeans in Canaan, who, when they carried the flower of the nation into captivity, were careful to leave no smiths behind who might forge arms for the "lowest of the people" who were allowed to remain in the country. On the present occasion we find that the effect of this procedure was to deprive the Israelites of the most efficient weapons, such as swords and spears, and probably their chief arms were bows and arrows, slings, and clubs. This is intimated by the inspired writer. "So it came to pass in the day of battle, that there was neither sword nor spear in the hand of any of the people that were with Saul, and with Jonathan his son; but with Saul and with Jonathan his son was there found," namely, the king and his eldest son were the only persons provided with these weapons.

While Saul remained "in the uttermost part of Gibeah under a pomegranate-tree which is in Migron," at the head of his six hundred men, his son Jonathan, unknown to him, but excited

by divine impulse, otherwise the exploit would have been rash and criminal, proposed to his armour-bearer to go over to the garrison of the Philistines. "It may be," he said, "that the Lord will work for us; for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few." The armour-bearer readily assented, and Jonathan farther said—"If they say unto us, Tarry until we come to you; then we will stand still in our place, and will not go up unto them: but if they say thus, Come up unto us; then we will go up, for the Lord hath delivered them into our hand, and this shall be a sign unto us." It appears that the Philistines were encamped in such a position as to command an important defile or passage leading to Michmash, which it was thought necessary to secure, and that as yet they had seen none of the Israelites, who had kept in their places of concealment. We are told that "between the passages by which Jonathan sought to go over unto the Philistines' garrison, there was a sharp rock on the one side, and a sharp rock on the other; and the name of the one was Bozez, and the name of the other Seneh." Jonathan and his armour-bearer stationed themselves on one of those rocks, and they were soon recognised by the Philistines, who understood this to be an intimation that the Hebrews were "coming forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves." They challenged Jonathan—"Come up to us, and we will show you a thing." The invitation was accepted, and as soon as he and his armour-bearer attained the eminence on which the Philistines had encamped, they fell upon the enemy, and slew twenty men. We are told that "there was trembling in the host, in the field, and among all the people; the garrison, and the spoilers, they also trembled, and the earth quaked; so it was a very great trembling." Some think that this was a real earthquake, which increased the panic of the Philistines, and in the Hebrew the phrase, *a very great trembling*, is a *trembling of God*; but it may also be a metaphorical expression intimat-

ing the great tumult into which the enemy were thrown.

The disorder and noise attracted the notice of Saul's sentinels in Gibeah, who "looked, and behold the multitude melted away, and they went on beating down one another." This means that the numbers of the Philistines were continually decreasing, from the confusion into which they were thrown. Saul was convinced that some of his six hundred followers must be concerned in this extraordinary matter, and ordered them all to be numbered that the absentees might be known. When the whole were numbered it was found that the only persons not present at Gibeah were Jonathan and his armour-bearer. Saul ordered that Jehovah should be consulted in the ark, but while he was giving directions to the high priest Ahiah for that purpose, the noise in the Philistine army increased, and the king commanded Ahiah to "withdraw his hand." Saul attacked the Philistines, who sustained a complete defeat and great slaughter, and the "battle passed over into Beth-aven." This statement seems to intimate that this running fight continued till they came to this place, which lay westward of Michmash, and that there the Philistines threw away their arms, and fled with the utmost precipitation towards their own country.

Notwithstanding this victory the Israelites were in the greatest distress for want of food. It is stated that Saul had "adjured the people," saying, "Cursed be the man that eateth any food until evening, that I may be avenged on mine enemies." As his intention in making this adjuration was unquestionable, it being to execute vengeance on the enemies of God and of his people, the matter of the obligation was not in itself unlawful, if he had not been too rigorous in the exclusion of food, without admitting cases of necessity, and by obliging the people to observe it under the pain of dying an accursed death, which was a punishment far exceeding the fault. It was in reality one of those reckless and imprudent actions, though not of a very

aggravated description, which Saul was often guilty of throughout life, and which were the causes of all the misfortunes of himself and his family. The consequence of this adjuration in the present instance was that when Saul's soldiers during the pursuit of the Philistines came to a wood, where they found delicious honey dropping from the honey-combs of wild bees in the trees, and literally wasting on the ground, yet not one of them "put his hand to his mouth," on account of the oath, though a repast of it would have been of the utmost consequence to invigorate their exhausted bodies. It happened that Jonathan and his armour-bearer came up, and as they had been absent at the time this oath was taken by Saul and his followers they knew nothing of it, and freely partook of the honey. Jonathan's "eyes were enlightened," namely, he received new strength, by which all his senses were cheered and revived. A person mentioned to him his father's oath and its consequences, to whom Jonathan replied—"My father hath troubled the land: see, I pray you, how mine eyes have been enlightened, because I tasted a little of this honey. How much more, if haply the people had eaten freely to-day of the spoil of their enemies which they found? for had there not been now a much greater slaughter among the Philistines?" He means that their bodily strength would have been renewed, and they would have been enabled to continue the pursuit, and make a greater slaughter of their enemies.

The Hebrews, after "smiting the Philistines from Michmash to Aijalon," at length became so faint from want of provisions, that they hastily killed oxen, sheep, and calves, and wanting patience to dress the food in a proper manner, they ate it half boiled and half roasted, with the blood not duly drained from it, which was an express violation of the Law of Moses. This was told to Saul, who proclaimed to them that they had transgressed, and ordered a great stone to be rolled to him. He is supposed to have wanted this "great stone" either for building an

altar, which we find he immediately did, or might slaughter their animals on it before God and under his own view; or that the blood of the animal slaughtered might sooner run off, by its head hanging down from the stone, for in the other case they had killed their animals on the level ground, by which the blood was so long in running out of the carcase that their hunger prevented them from waiting for it in a proper manner. Saul farther issued an order—"Disperse yourselves among the people, and say unto them, Bring me hither every man his ox, and every man his sheep, and slay them here, and eat; and sin not against the Lord in eating with the blood." The king's intention in erecting this altar was either to offer sacrifices of peace-offerings, and to return thanks to Jehovah for this great victory; or it was a memorial, in the form of an altar, to perpetuate the divine mercy in the late deliverance. Saul then declared—"Let us go down after the Philistines by night, and spoil them until the morning light, and let us not leave a man of them." This proposal was cordially received, and the high priest prepared to consult Jehovah. No answer was returned, and it was at once concluded by the king that some transgression had been committed which had provoked the divine displeasure. Saul anxiously said—"Draw ye near hither all the chief of the people, and know and see wherein this sin hath been this day: for, as the Lord liveth, which saveth Israel, though it be in Jonathan, my son, he shall surely die." As no one was conscious of having committed any heinous or special sin, no answer was returned to this exhortation to confess. Saul then proposed to be on one side with Jonathan, while the chiefs of the Hebrews would be on the other side; and this distinction having been made, he said to Jehovah, "Give a perfect lot;" or, as it is more appropriately rendered in the margin, "Show the innocent." The *lot*, if we may so express it, for the word is printed in our version in *italics*, and is not in the original, fell on Saul and Jonathan, which

at once exonerated the people. It was plain that the offence lay between the king and his son, and in the farther investigation of the affair Jonathan was implicated. In reply to his father's question of what he had done, Jonathan confessed that he had eaten a little honey, and thought it hard that for this simple act he was to be put to death; but the king replied, "God do so, and more also; for thou shalt surely die, Jonathan." But when the people heard this decision they exclaimed—"Shall Jonathan die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel? God forbid: as the Lord liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground, for he hath wrought with God this day." Jonathan was thus saved by their petition to Saul and their earnest prayers to Jehovah, who probably signified to the high priest that He approved of the people's desire, and annulled Saul's oath because it was rash and inconsiderate. "Saul's conduct on this memorable day," says Dr Hales, "was rash and impolitic in the extreme. Instead of trusting in the Lord to avenge himself of his enemies, like his pious son Jonathan, he cursed any of the people who would eat food until the evening, that nothing might interrupt the slaughter; but he *troubled the land* thereby, for the people, growing faint with hunger, were forced to transgress, and Jonathan would have suffered death for inadvertently incurring the curse, if the people had not interfered in his favour."

Saul now increased his army by degrees, and when he saw "any strong man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him," and he provided all his soldiers with suitable arms, of which we have already seen the Hebrews had been previously destitute. He fought successfully against the Philistines, his nearest and most powerful foes, with whom he had to contend during the whole of his reign. He subdued the Ammonites, Moabites, and the nomade tribes of the Arabian desert, the Hagarites, Itureans, and others, whose pasture grounds extended as far as the Euphrates; and he conquer-

ed the king of Zobah, who was, perhaps, a successor of Chushan-rishathaim, a former oppressor of the Hebrews. The Amalekites, those ancient and persevering enemies of the Israelites, against whom the ban of extermination had been long pronounced—who had inhumanly waylaid and attacked them in the Desert in the time of Moses—were now to undergo their punishment, and Samuel was ordered to intimate to Saul that he was to put it into execution. The Prophet, by divine command, sought an interview with the king, and, after reminding him of the facts connected with his elevation to the throne, emphatically said—“Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way when he came up from Egypt: Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.” This divine command, given for the wisest of purposes and the most obvious reasons, has been severely and daringly commented on by writers of a certain description, and has been impiously denounced by those who unhappily for themselves have adopted their sentiments. It is not for erring man to scan the arrangements of the great Jehovah, the Author and Lord of all, or arrogantly exclaim, “What doest thou?” The command was in conformity with the spirit of the times, and while it was necessary that divine justice should be vindicated, it was to work out the designs of his providence, and to be an awful example to the neighbouring nations. Nor is there in reality, as Dr Samuel Clarke observes, any material difference whether God commands a whole nation, without distinction of persons, to be destroyed in war, as in the case of Amalek and the Canaanitish nations, or whether he consumes by a flood, as at the universal Deluge, or by fire from heaven, as in the case of Sodom, or by a sudden earthquake, by pestilential diseases, or by a natural death. The cruelty of

which the Amalekites were guilty without any provocation from the Israelites, then in a state of comparative helplessness, was aggravated by their own ferocious habits—a fact which is plainly intimated in the narrative, and they were not exterminated till after a respite of four hundred years from the time when their sentence was first pronounced, thus proving that Jehovah in every age acted as He still does, and gives both individuals and nations time for repentance, until their obstinate and continued wickedness prompts him to execute His vengeance by any instrument which in His sovereign wisdom He may adopt.

The Arabs believe that those Amalekites were immediately descended from Ad, the son of Amalek, who spread themselves in Arabia Petræa, the peninsula of Sinai, and in the southern parts of Palestine, were the hereditary enemies of the Israelites here mentioned. They were an unsettled, savage, and predatory people, and, besides the first deep cause of offence recorded by Moses, there was an obvious necessity that such dangerous and plundering neighbours should be extirpated or driven from the frontiers of a people settled and pastoral like the Hebrews. Against this ferocious race Saul marched an army of ten thousand men of Judah, and two hundred thousand of the other tribes, which he had mustered at Telaim, supposed to be Telem, situated among the “innermost cities of the tribe of Judah, towards the coast of Edom southwards.” In his march he warned the Kenites, because they had shown “kindness to all the children of Israel when they came out of Egypt,” not to assist the Amalekites, but to depart from among them, assuring them, from the nature of his divine commission, that they would otherwise be destroyed. The Kenites were prudent to obey the notice, and save themselves. No particulars are given of the war, or what resistance the Amalekites made. It is simply said that he smote them “from Havilah until thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt.” Some suppose

that this Havilah is the same as that mentioned in the description of the Garden of Eden, near the head of the Persian Gulf, but it is utterly incredible that Saul traversed all the wide distance; and the text expressly intimates that the pursuit was *towards* Egypt, and not *from* it, which the other Havilah would make it. There was evidently more than one Havilah—an inference fairly deducible when we recollect that Havilah, the son of Cush, may, like his father, have given his name to different regions, in which his descendants settled at various times.

We are told that Saul "took Agag, the king of the Amalekites, alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword." This *utter destruction* or *extermination* of the Amalekites must be understood as referring to the Adite Amalekites solely, for we find that nomade Arabs of the Amalek race existed as a people after this fatal blow to their strength and consolidation. David, we are expressly informed, undertook an expedition against them during his residence in the country of the Philistines. After this indeed they cease to be historically noticed, yet we find Haman, an *Amalekite*, introduced in a remarkable manner in the Book of Esther. On the present occasion Saul "utterly destroyed" the Adite Amalekites, and those of the other branch of that nation who might be residing among them, but he made one fatal exception—"he spared Agag," their king, their chief, or their sheikh, and he also spared "the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them; but every thing that was vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly." Josephus says that Saul and the people were induced to save Agag by the beauty and stateliness of his person, but whatever may have been his motive it was a direct violation of the divine command; a fearful penalty was the consequence, and from this time commenced that series of misfortunes which terminated in the destruction of himself and of his family. He returned

from this important expedition rejoicing in his success, and fully persuaded that he had fulfilled the divine injunction. But the case was widely different, and we have an illustration, in this part of the history of Saul, that "God's ways are not as our ways, neither are his thoughts as our thoughts." The inspired historian says—"The word of the Lord came unto Samuel, saying, It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king, for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments." This ominous intimation from Jehovah "grieved Samuel, and he cried unto the Lord all night." The phrase, *it repenteth me*, must be understood as meaning that God had resolved to punish Saul by deposing him from his dignity—a fact which Samuel had already intimated directly to Saul, but which seems to have made little or no impression. As soon as it was known to Samuel that the king and his army had returned from the expedition against the Amalekites he proceeded to Gilgal, where he was accosted by Saul in language which implied that he was fully convinced he had done his duty—"Blessed be thou of the Lord," he said to the Prophet, "I have performed the commandment of the Lord."

But as Saul was peremptorily enjoined not only to exterminate the Amalekites, without distinction of rank, age, or sex, and to take no spoil, "ox or sheep, camel or ass," from the appearance of the neighbourhood of Gilgal, he at once saw that the commands of Jehovah had not been obeyed. "What meaneth then," asked the indignant seer, taking no notice of, or at least not replying to, Saul's salutation, "this bleating of the sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?" The king, who expected praise instead of reproof for his conduct, was startled at the language of the Prophet, and replied in explanation—"They [the people] have brought them from the Amalekites, for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice unto the

Lord thy God, and the rest we have utterly destroyed." Respecting this excuse Dr Samuel Clarke has a fine explanatory passage. "As one sin naturally draws on another, Saul, having first transgressed in the principal action, falls into other continual provocations. When Samuel comes to meet him he first presumptuously declares that he had obeyed the commandment of the Lord. When the falsity of this declaration was immediately laid open, he endeavours to transfer the fault from himself to others, as if what the people did was not done by his direction and authority. This being too apparent to be denied, he next adds an excuse, drawn from a pretence of religion, which was as much as to say that he had disobeyed the commands of God in order to serve Him."

The Prophet remonstrated with Saul on the folly of his conduct. He reminded him that he was commissioned to discharge a specific duty, the nature of which was fully explained to him, and which he was expected to perform to the very letter—that there were no limitations or exceptions—and that he appeared to understand distinctly the purport of the divine command. He therefore solemnly asked him—"Wherefore, then, didst thou not obey the voice of the Lord, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the Lord?" When Saul persisted in throwing the blame upon the people, and in still excusing himself under the pretence of religion, the Prophet addressed him in this emphatic and eloquent language—"Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." Samuel then ordered Agag to be brought before him, and the unhappy Amalekite "came unto him delicately," namely, not like an offender expecting to be put to

death, but in the dress and manner which suited his kingly quality. Having been spared by Saul, he apprehended no danger from Samuel, and he addressed the Prophet in these expressive words—"Surely the bitterness of death is past." But the bitterness of death was *not past*, and an appalling fate awaited him—"As thy sword," exclaimed the indignant seer, "hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women." Agag was "hewed in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal," and it appears from the Prophet's words that he was not cut off merely for the sins of his ancestors, but for his own merciless cruelties.

After this remarkable transaction Samuel had no farther intercourse with Saul, and "came no more to see him until the day of his death," yet he "mourned" for him, and lamented his conduct. On this subject Professor Jahn makes some appropriate observations. "Saul affected no great external splendour. He was a *hero* in the true sense of the word.—He never neglected the internal concerns of his kingdom. He tolerated no instance of rebellion against Jehovah, and was very severe in the punishment of idolatrous acts; consequently the Hebrew arms, according to the divine promise, were every where successful. In every respect he seems to have discharged the trust reposed in him for the good of the state; no complaint was uttered against him after his death, and eleven tribes remained faithfully attached to his son. Saul's great failing, and the source of all his errors, was that he did not sufficiently give way to the theocratic nature of the Hebrew constitution. He thus rendered himself unfit to be the founder of a royal house, as his conduct could not be regarded as a pattern for the imitation of his successors. He forgot that he was a vassal of Jehovah, and did not always execute his orders, but made exceptions according to his own views. When on one occasion a part of his soldiers deserted him, and the rest were trembling with fear, he ought to have entertained the theocratic senti-

ments of Gideon, and given to all his successors a signal example of confidence in God. By neglecting to do this, and by conducting himself as a king altogether independent of Jehovah, Samuel announced to him, in the name of God, the transfer of the sceptre to another family. When Saul, after this, neglected the divine command, and held back the predicted punishment of the ancient, marauding, hereditary enemies of the Hebrews, the Amalekites; and, instead of utterly destroying them, retained the best of the cattle as booty, and brought Agag their king as a prisoner—thus concluding the war without annihilating the nation—the divine decree for the exclusion of his descendants from the throne was again and irrevocably pronounced by Samuel. This was made known to Saul at a time when he was daily strengthening himself on the throne, and increasing in power and fame; and when Jonathan his eldest son was so much beloved by the people, that certainly no man could look on any one else as likely to succeed to the crown."

"During this period," continues our author, "so prosperous for Saul, the invisible King directed the Prophet Samuel to assure the throne privately, by a prophetic anointing, to David, the youngest son of Jesse, a citizen of Bethlehem. He was of a princely family in the tribe of Judah, a tribe which in ancient times had received great promises. David, at that time a youth of eighteen or twenty years of age, and deeply imbued with the spirit of the religion and theocracy of the nation, was shepherd of his father's flocks—a condition which in the East is by no means despised, but yet not so elevated that he who had only governed his flocks, and had carried on no wars but those against the wild beasts which attacked them, could aspire to a throne. The invisible Ruler of Israel, however, so directed events, that Saul himself contributed most towards rendering this magnanimous young man an experienced and worthy viceroy of Jehovah; for when he, by continually brooding over that determi-

nation of God, so unwelcome to his feelings, at last fell into a deep melancholy, in order to divert his thoughts he took David into his court as a private musician, and thus gave him an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the manners of the court and the business of government. The personal bravery of the young minstrel did not long remain unnoticed by the veteran hero, and he soon elevated him to the honourable station of royal armour-bearer."

We are now introduced to the war between the Philistines and the Israelites, in which the champion of the former was slain by David, and the personal history of Saul becomes inseparably connected with that of his rival and successor, which is amply narrated in its proper place (see DAVID). In concluding this sketch of the life and actions of the first king of the Hebrews, it is only necessary to notice his celebrated transaction with the "woman who had a familiar spirit," and whose residence was at En-dor, in the tribe of Manasseh, west of the Jordan.

We are particularly informed that "Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land." This was in accordance with that injunction in the Mosaic ritual—"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. or all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." It appears from the intimation of the inspired historian that Saul had rigidly enforced this injunction of the Law, and he must therefore have been dreaded by the secret professors of the deceptive art, and by all those credulous persons who foolishly employ such agents to give them information respecting futurity. In the unhappy state to which Saul had reduced himself by

his disobedience to the commands of Jehovah—when he “inquired of the Lord, and the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets”—he imprudently said to his servants, “Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her.” This was occasioned by a war with the Philistines, who “gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem,” and “when Saul saw the host of the Philistines he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled.”

The king was informed that a woman of this description resided at En-dor, and he determined to visit her in the hope of obtaining that consolation which was denied to him in the ordinary and legitimate manner. In having recourse to such a person, as Bishop Patrick remarks, Saul “acted like a distracted person. He had banished all wizards and sorcerers from his kingdom, as a dangerous sort of people who made profession of a wicked and unwarrantable art, yet he put his whole confidence in one, as capable of allaying the uneasiness of his mind, and of rescuing him from the apprehension of danger.” We are told that he “disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night.”

Here two important intimations in the sacred narrative are to be kept in view—he *disguised himself*, and he *came to the woman by night*. Saul knew that if the woman had any suspicion of his rank, she would probably deny her addiction to the deceptive art, yet it appears that she had some suspicion who the tall stranger was, from the manner in which she alluded to his name. When Saul accosted her he said—“I pray thee, divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me him up whom I shall name unto thee.” It thus appears, that in those ancient times those who pretended to the spirit of divination affected to have the power of obtaining access to the
of the dead, or of summoning

the dead to appear to those who desired their presence. They were evidently persons whom we call necromancers, a belief in whose pretended powers has existed in all countries, and is still cherished by the credulous even in Britain. The *witch of En-dor*, as she is commonly called, evidently suspected the rank and identity of the king, yet she did not choose to recognise him, and in reply to his request she said,—“Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land; wherefore then layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?” Saul gave her the most solemn assurance that “no punishment would happen to her,” and she asked him to inform her what he wished her to do. The king replied that he wished her to “bring up” the deceased Prophet Samuel. She commenced her incantations, or whatever ceremonies she chose to exhibit, and to her astonishment a form resembling the Prophet actually appeared. “Why hast thou deceived me,” she said in terror and amazement to the king, “for thou art Saul?” The king replied—“Be not afraid: for what sawest thou?” She answered—“I saw gods ascending out of the earth.” The word *elohim*, here rendered *gods*, is often used in the singular to denote a *god*, or a great and important personage; but, says Dr Chandler, “if the plural be retained, we must suppose that, in order to raise Saul’s attention, and his opinion of her art and power, she pretends that she saw *gods* rising out of the earth, as if she had brought up several ghosts by her enchantments.” Saul, however, understood this Pythoness to intimate only one person, and he inquired—“What form is he of?” “An old man cometh up,” she replied, “and he is covered with a mantle.” When “Saul perceived that it was Samuel, he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself.”

The remarkable transaction recorded in this chapter of the First Book of Samuel is one of those occurrences which probably cannot, and never will, be ex-

plained in a satisfactory manner. It has given occasion to much controversy, and the discussion has turned chiefly on the points whether the appearance of the deceased Prophet was real, and, if real, the power by which the extraordinary resuscitation was produced ; or whether it was an imposition of the woman on the credulity of Saul. An investigation of this difficult subject, which has greatly perplexed commentators and critics, would lead us into a discussion respecting the alleged crime of witchcraft, for which many think there is some foundation in truth. We certainly have innumerable instances to this purpose which it would not be fair, on the common principles of reasoning, to reject, merely because they are not reconcilable to philosophy. The absurdities generally told, and the many impostures and delusions which have been discovered, are sufficient to demolish all credulity in this dubious crime, yet the contrary evidence is sufficiently strong, and there seems to be something in philosophy to countenance it. The celebrated Judge Blackstone refers to an article by Mr Addison in the Spectator respecting the possibility of the reality of the crime, though no credit can be given to any particular modern instance of it, and it is well known that it prevailed to such an extent in England and Scotland at one period that several statutes were enacted against it, many persons also suffering death for their addiction to its extraordinary incantations. It is now admitted that the whole is a delusion, which has been accounted for and explained on most satisfactory philosophical principles, and the times of its existence and belief are justly characterized as times of gross ignorance and superstition.

But, with reference to the instance before us, the supposition which at one time prevailed, that the spirit of Samuel really appeared to Saul at the invocation of this woman, is now generally rejected ; yet the text certainly conveys the impression that the appearance was real, and that this was the opinion of the

ancient Jewish Church we learn from a passage in the Apocryphal Book of Ecclesiasticus, where the son of Sirach says of Samuel (xlvi. 20), that "after his death he prophesied and showed the king his end." Josephus also describes the appearance as really that of Samuel, and this was the opinion of the early Christian Fathers. In accordance with this view, and more especially with reference to the fact that the inspired historian affirms that the woman saw the real Samuel, and that Samuel spoke to Saul, some have contended that the appearance was a divine miracle, resulting from the power of God, and intended as a rebuke and punishment to Saul. This view is maintained by the learned Dr Waterland, and defended by Dr Delaney in his life of David, but is combated by Dr Chandler, whose opinions in turn are answered by Farmer in his Dissertation on Miracles. Other pious and learned writers have inclined to Dr Waterland's opinion. "The gravity and suitability of the answer," says Bishop Wilson, "show that it was the spirit of Samuel himself, and the event shows that it was from God." "That God," says Bishop Horne, "should permit evil spirits, employed by a wretched woman, to summon at pleasure his departed servants from the other world, is not to be imagined. It remains therefore either that the whole affair of Samuel's appearance was a contrivance, or that by the interposition of God there was a real appearance, which the enchantress did not expect, and could not have effected. The surprise and alarm occasioned in her seem to favour the latter supposition." Thus it is probable that when Saul was hoping to receive some kind answer from Samuel, and would have received a favourable one from some pretended Samuel, God, was pleased to disappoint both the sorceress and him by sending the *true Samuel*, with a true and faithful message, quite contrary to what the woman and Saul had expected, which so confounded and disordered him that he instantly fell into a swoon, and could no longer bear up against the bitter

agonies of his mind." Dr Gray says—"The most probable and best supported opinion is, that God suffered Samuel's departed spirit, or a miraculous representation of his person, to appear to Saul, and, as a punishment for his presumptuous impiety, to disclose his impending fate. The text positively calls him Samuel—in the original, *Samuel himself*; and what he prophesied proved true, for *on the morrow*, that is, soon after, Saul and his sons were slain, and the host of Israel defeated. The woman was herself terrified at a real appearance, which probably she designed a deception, and was preparing her incantations." Dr Hales, in his *New Analysis of Chronology*, has an able article on this view of the subject, and assigns the following among the reasons for the permitted appearance to Saul—"1. To make Saul's crime the instrument of his punishment, in the dreadful denunciation of his approaching doom. 2. To show to the heathen world the infinite superiority of the *oracle of the Lord* inspiring his prophets, over the powers of darkness and the delusive prognostics of their wretched votaries in their false oracles. 3. To confirm the belief in a future state, by *one who rose from the dead* (Luke xvi. 31) even under the Mosaic dispensation."

To all this it has been objected that the reality of the appearance of the deceased prophet to Saul is repugnant to the order of the natural world, and to the doctrines of revelation respecting the state of the dead—that it cannot be supposed consistent with a just reverence of God to believe that He has subjected the souls of the departed, not excepting those of the most eminent saints and prophets, to be summoned from their distinct abodes by the practice of the most detestable rites, and at the call of the vilest of mortals, merely to satisfy idle curiosity, and compelled to reveal what the Deity has thought proper to conceal. There is much truth in these observations, and natural reason confirms the testimony of the Scriptures when it brands the whole magic art as founded in imposture.

Yet we must not dogmatically limit the power of the Almighty, nor assume *that* to be impossible with Him which may and doubtless does appear impossible to men. Our blessed Saviour raised Lazarus from the grave, after he had been entombed some days, and He himself consummated the Christian dispensation by rising from the dead on the third day after his crucifixion, and by continuing some time with his faithful followers, during which time, as St Paul expresses it, he was "seen of angels, believed by men," and then "received up into glory."

There are various other opinions respecting this remarkable occurrence, such as—that there was no real appearance of the prophet to Saul, but that a delusion was practised upon him by some person acting in concert with the Pythoness, and making responses to him in a feigned voice. In support of this theory it is argued that the inspired historian does not say that Saul really saw Samuel, but that "Saul perceived it was Samuel," or knew him by the description given by the woman. It has also been conjectured that some evil spirit appeared in the likeness and manner of the prophet, and was enabled to make the predictions contained in the answer. Others, again, contend that it was neither Samuel nor an evil spirit who appeared to Saul, and that the whole was the work of human imposture, the woman being a ventriloquist, and the possessor of an art extremely serviceable to those who counterfeited the answers of the dead. All these suppositions are beset with difficulties, and it may be replied to all of them that they contradict the sacred historian, who does not give the least hint that he is not the real Samuel of whom he is speaking. The supposition of an evil spirit being the apparition offers an unwarrantable advantage for the support of idolatry to those impostures which were practised by idolatrous sorcerers and diviners. Moreover, the appearance of a spiritual being endowed with the gift of prophecy is itself a miracle, and cannot possibly take place except by divine appointment.

In the present case we farther find that the apparition conjured by the Pythoness, instead of being a tempter or deceiver, announced to Saul his fate in a most distinct manner, and severely reproved him for his impiety and wickedness. We must bear in mind that the *real* Samuel is throughout represented as speaking, and he intimates certain facts to Saul which the king well knew, and for which he had been reproached by Samuel when in life on several memorable occasions. "Wherefore, then," exclaimed Samuel, "dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me, for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbour, even to David; because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines, and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." In this address the identity of the speaker is unquestionable, and we find that every intimation was fulfilled.

The conclusion of this singular scene deserves notice. It is likely that Samuel immediately disappeared, and left Saul prostrate on the ground in terror and consternation. The woman then reminded the king that she had placed her life in his hands, by letting him know that she practised arts of divination. She persuaded Saul to "eat a morsel of bread" before he departed, as he had "eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night." He at first refused, but he was at length persuaded by his attendants and the woman. She had a "fat calf in the house, and she hasted, and killed it, and took flour, and kneaded it, and did bake unleavened bread thereof; and she brought it before Saul, and before his servants, and they did eat. Then they rose up, and went their way."

Soon afterwards Saul fell in the manner elsewhere related. (See DAVID.) His sons were involved in his misfortunes, and the bones of those who were slain, with those of the unhappy king, were buried under a tree at Jabesh—a place where his public history commenced, and where it terminated. His family became extinct, and the attempts to preserve any one of them on the throne proved abortive, and were at length abandoned. Such is Saul's history, and such was the fate of a man chosen by Jehovah to the throne of his people—a man who was enriched by the blessings of heaven, but on account of his abuse of them was at last made an example of God's righteous indignation.

SAUL. See PAUL.

SENNACHERIB, an ancient king of Assyria, whose military exploits are very prominently noticed in the Scriptures. He was the son of Tiglath-pileser, and grandson of Pul, and he succeeded to the Assyrian throne about the year B.C. 712. Resolving to punish Hezekiah, king of Judah, for an insult, either real or imaginary, offered to his father's authority, he invaded Judah with an immense army, besieged Lachish, and threatened to invest Jerusalem. Hezekiah sent a submissive embassy to this potent conqueror, and purchased an inglorious peace, by paying him thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver. Sennacherib took the money, but after he had gained possession of Ashdod, the key to Egypt, he chose to forget his engagements and protestations. He prosecuted the war against Hezekiah with renewed vigour, and sent a powerful army commanded by three of his generals to besiege Jerusalem. A report having been spread that Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia, assisted by reinforcements from Egypt, was advancing to aid Hezekiah, Sennacherib marched to meet his approaching enemies, to whom he gave battle, defeated them, ravaged part of their territories, and returned with rich spoils to finish the siege of Jerusalem. The result of this undertaking is well known. The

distress and piety of Hezekiah obtained for him the assistance of Jehovah, while the insolence and pride of Sennacherib caused him to lose, by a Divine interposition, one hundred and eighty-five thousand men of the Assyrian army in one night. Overwhelmed with this destruction, and enraged with shame and disappointment at the ruin of his army, he returned to Assyria, and his mortification was increased when he found that the Medes had embraced the favourable opportunity to throw off his yoke. He appears to have exercised the greatest cruelties towards his own subjects, and especially towards those Hebrews of the Ten Tribes carried into captivity by his father. He was assassinated by two of his sons, Adrammelech and Sharazer, while he was worshipping in the temple of his idol Nisroch at Nineveh. The perpetrators of this deed fled into Armenia, and Esar-haddon, his third son, succeeded him.

The overthrow of Sennacherib, whose expedition was designed particularly against Egypt, is described by Herodotus in his Second Book, but evidently corrupted by the Egyptian priests, from whom the Greek historian received the narration. "After this, a priest of Vulcan, by name Setho, ascended the throne. He very imprudently treated the soldiers with great severity, as though he should never stand in need of their services. He insulted them in many ways, and took from them the lands which had been granted to them by former kings, at the rate of twelve *aruræ* to a man. But afterwards when Sennacherib, king of the Arabs and Assyrians, was advancing against Egypt with a great army, the Egyptian soldiers refused to lend their aid against him. The priest was now in great perplexity, and going into the temple he complained to his idol with tears of the peril in which he was. In the midst of his complaints he was overtaken by sleep, and there appeared to him in a vision the god standing by him, and bidding him be of good courage, for no misfortune should befall him in encountering

the Arabian army, for he himself would send him helpers. Confiding in this dream he took such Egyptians as were willing to follow him, and encamped at Pelusium, for through this place the soldiers must necessarily make the attack. None of the soldiers followed him, but only the merchants, artificers, and populace. When they arrived there, field mice in great numbers spread themselves about among their enemies, and gnawed in pieces the quivers, and bows, and thongs of the shields, so that on the following morning they were obliged to flee, destitute of arms, and many fell. Even to this day there stands in the Temple of Vulcan a stone statue of this king, having a mouse in his hand, and speaking by an inscription to the following manner, *Let him who looks on me reverence the gods.*"

Jahn observes on this passage of Herodotus—"From this narrative it is plain that the Egyptians attributed their deliverance from Sennacherib to a deity, and to that deity whom the Greeks call Vulcan. Among the Egyptians he is named *Phtha* or *Kneph*, and because he is said to have made the world, he is also called the *Artificer*. Now, as the God of the Hebrews was the Creator of the world, the Egyptians might easily confound him with their Phtha, and attribute this deliverance to the latter. The circumstance of Setho going into the temple, and complaining of his danger to Phtha, is manifestly borrowed from what is related of Hezekiah, Isa. xxxvii. 14, 15."

SHALLUM, a king of the Ten Tribes who murdered Zechariah, and usurped his throne, B.C. 773. This fulfilled the prophecy that the family of Jehu should retain the throne only to the fourth generation. Notwithstanding the disorders and disturbances of the kingdom Shallum collected a force sufficient to conquer Thapsacus, or Tiphshah, on which occasion he treated the inhabitants with great cruelty. After a reign of only one month he was slain in Samaria by his general Menahem, who succeeded him on the throne. The text (2 Kings

xv. 13-16) attributes the conquest of Tiphshah to Menahem, but he might have taken that city while he commanded the army of Shallum. Various other persons named SHALLUM are mentioned in the historical Books.

SHALMANEZER, a sovereign of the ancient and powerful kingdom of Assyria, invaded Hoshea, or Hosea, king of Israel, and compelled him to become tributary. He reigned fourteen years. See HOSHEA.

SHAMGAR, the son of Anath, by profession a husbandman, is mentioned as a remarkable deliverer of the Israelites from the oppression of their inveterate enemies the Philistines. In the first attempt which that people made to bring the southern tribes under their yoke, he "slew of them six hundred men with an ox-goad." Maundrell notices this weapon in the following manner:—"At Kane Leban (a place about a day's journey from Jerusalem) the country people, at the time when I was there, were ploughing everywhere in the fields. It was observable that in ploughing they used goads of an extraordinary size. I found some of them on measuring to be eight feet long, and at the bigger end six inches in circumference. They were armed at the lesser end with a sharp prickler for driving the oxen, and at the other end with a small spade or paddle of iron, strong and massy, for cleansing the plough from the clay which encumbers it in working. May we not hence conjecture that it was with such a goad as one of these that Shamgar made that prodigious slaughter? I am confident that whoever should see one of these instruments, which are commonly used in all these parts, would judge it to be a weapon not less fit, perhaps fitter, than a sword for such an execution." In the song of Deborah and Barak it is stated—"In the days of Shamgar, the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways." This is to be understood as referring to the wretched condition of the Israelites in those days,

who, having become corrupted in their religion, were so depraved as to commit every species of violence and robbery, assaulting travellers in the open day.

SHEM, one of Noah's three sons, whose descendants are supposed to have peopled Asia. He is noticed by the inspired historian as if he had been the eldest of Noah's sons, but it subsequently appears that he was the second son—Japheth being the eldest, and Ham the youngest. Shem is named first, either because the rights of primogeniture were transferred to him, though the sacred writer gives no intimation to that effect, or because it was the purpose of Jehovah to show that he would not be confined to the order of nature in the disposal of his favours, which he frequently bestowed on younger sons—"or, what I think the most likely," says Stackhouse, "because the nation of the Jews were to descend from him, and he and his posterity were to be the principal subjects of the whole history of Scripture."

SHEMAIAH, the name of several persons mentioned in the Old Testament, the most distinguished of whom was a prophet who flourished in the reign of Rehoboam, and who is supposed to have written the annals of that prince's reign. Few particulars are recorded respecting him. He was commissioned by Jehovah to prohibit Rehoboam's attempt to reduce the revolted Tribes to obedience, and he prevailed with the king and 180,000 men to relinquish the enterprise, by declaring that the separation which had taken place was by the Divine appointment. See REHOBAM.

SHIMEI, the son of Gera, and a relative of Saul, is introduced to our notice as insulting David in the most wanton and outrageous manner in the presence of his principal officers, designating him by the most offensive epithets—"Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial." Shimei appears to have viewed David as an ambitious usurper, who had supplanted Saul's family, and who was deservedly punished by Absalom's rebellion. Abishai, the son

of Zeruiah, would have slain him on the spot, but he was prevented by David, who acted in the most forbearing manner. He was put to death shortly after the accession of Solomon for transgressing the conditions imposed upon him to live as a peaceable subject. See DAVID. Several other persons of this name are mentioned in the historical Books of the Old Testament.

SIHON, an ancient king of the Amorites. See MOSES.

SILAS, a companion and coadjutor of St Paul, who was imprisoned with him at Philippi when those remarkable events occurred which caused the conversion of the Philippian Jailor. He is the same as Silvanus, and is honourably noticed by that Apostle in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, along with Timothy, as one of the founders of the church of Corinth. It is not known whether he was the Silvanus mentioned by St Peter as a "faithful brother."

SIMON, a name of St Peter. See PETER.

SIMON the Zealot is the same Apostle who is called in the other catalogues by the name of the Canaanite. St Matthew and St Mark give him the latter appellation, and St Luke, in the Gospel and the Acts, mentions him always by the former. Some have supposed that he was called the Canaanite from being a native of Cana, and have even conjectured that he was the bridegroom at whose nuptials Christ performed his first miracle. But the more probable opinion, and that most commonly adopted, is, that *Zelotes* is the translation of Canaanite, which in the Hebrew signifies the same thing. It is probable, therefore, that Simon, like St Paul before his conversion, was one of the strictest sect of the Pharisees, though there is no proof to show that he ever went to the horrid excesses in which St Paul started on his public career, and which afterwards were prosecuted with such insane fury by the *sicarii*, or assassins. Upon the supposition mentioned as the correct one, we can go no farther than that Simon was a zealous supporter

of the Law of Moses against the Sadducees, and a strict adherent of the traditions of the pretended elders. We are not informed of the circumstances of his conversion, but he was a disciple during the first year of Christ's ministry, and was appointed an Apostle. He has also been mistaken by some for Simon, or Simeon, the son of Alphaeus and Mary. This also is inaccurate, and we are not informed of his parentage, or the place of his birth. No particular mention is made of him by the Evangelists, and we find his name only noticed at his consecration to the Apostolate, and again when the eleven met together at Jerusalem after the ascension. We conclude that he remained in that city, chiefly along with the other apostles, till they directed their attention to the wide field of the Gentile world. It is stated in the Roman martyrologies of a later age that he went to Mesopotamia, and travelled along with St Jude to Persia, but this rests upon no authority. The more probable account is, that he went first to Egypt, and propagated the Gospel along the southern coast of the Mediterranean. Nicephorus and the Greek Menologies relate that he came into Britain, and after much zealous and successful labour, and many miracles, at last suffered as a martyr and was buried there. The whole account is, however, so vague, and evidently so incapable of any good authentication, that it is unnecessary to give what is certainly, to a great extent, a doubtful narrative.

SISERA. See Jael.

SOLOMON, the son and successor of David, king of Israel, was one of the most celebrated monarchs of sacred or profane antiquity. So strong is the recollection of his "glory" in the East, that his name is associated with innumerable traditions, and immortalized in all the annals of the Oriental nations. A curious life of Solomon could be written from these traditions alone, which would show the strong impression which the grandeur and the wisdom of this celebrated prince has left, notwithstanding

ing the lapse of many centuries. His actions have never been surpassed by any Eastern monarch of modern times, especially when we consider the age in which he lived, and that he never appeared in the field as a great warrior. His reign is one of the most important in the annals of the Hebrew monarchy, and demands a careful and special investigation.

Solomon was one of the sons of David by Bathsheba, or Bathshuab, formerly the wife of Uriah the Hittite, and was born at Jerusalem in the year B. C. 1033, according to the Hebrew chronology. Of his early history and education nothing is recorded, and little is said of him until about six months before the death of David, when by the influence of his mother, and the recommendation of Nathan, Zadok, and other determined adherents, who thought it necessary to counteract the designs of Adonijah, the king's eldest son, he was proclaimed the destined successor to the throne. David died in the year B.C. 1015, and Solomon was then about eighteen years of age. It is well observed that "the last charges which the dying monarch gave to his successor are mentioned in the Scriptures as commendable, and, let men judge of them as they please, they are neither revengeful nor unjust, but strictly conformable to the divine precepts. According to the Law criminals were to be punished for the purpose of deterring others from the commission of similar offences, and it was with this view merely that David gave those directions, the execution of which he left entirely to the discretion of his successor."

At the accession of Solomon the Hebrew kingdom was greatly extended, and as the Israelites were feared by all the surrounding nations, his reign was peaceable. "Now," observes Jahn, "the predominant tribe of Judah lay as a lion, and as a lioness, which no nation ventured to rouse up; the Hebrews were the ruling people, and their empire the principal monarchy in Western Asia. From the Mediterranean Sea and the Phœnicians to the Euphrates, from the

river of Egypt and the Ælantic Gulf to Berytus, Hamath, and Thapsacus, and towards the east to the Hagarenes on the Persian Gulf—all were subject to the sway of Solomon. The Canaanites, indeed, had been neither annihilated nor expelled, but they were obedient and peaceable subjects. Their whole number might amount to between 400,000 and 500,000, since 150,000 were able to render soccage to the king. The warlike and civilized Philistines, the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, the nomadic Arabians of the Desert, and the Syrians of Damascus, were all tributary to him." The first public acts of Solomon are already alluded to. He put Adonijah to death, and also Joab and Shimei, on account of their crimes and treasonable intentions. He removed the high priest Abiathar, by which a prophecy was fulfilled, 1 Sam. viii. 9—18. The severity which he exercised on these occasions cannot be blamed, for they were all seditious and dangerous men, who would otherwise have instigated a civil war. The deposition of the high priest was no violation of the Law, which did not determine by what power that important personage in the Mosaic economy should be appointed.

When Solomon was established in his extensive and prosperous kingdom he made an alliance with the contemporary king of Egypt, and married a daughter of that monarch. He appears to have been influenced in this marriage by a desire to strengthen his interest with other nations, and as this is the first notice of the kings of Egypt since the time of Moses in the history of the Jews, we may conclude that the Egyptians had no connection for some centuries with the chosen people. Solomon brought his queen, with whom he received for her dowry the Canaanite city of Gezer, to Jerusalem, and soon afterwards erected for her a sumptuous palace. It was on occasion of this marriage, as some contend, that he wrote the *Song of Songs*, as a kind of epithalamium, and the 45th Psalm has been also referred to that event,

though many of the expressions in it are of such an exalted nature that they cannot with propriety be assigned to any other than to a "greater than Solomon"—our blessed Saviour, to whom St Paul expressly applies the sixth and seventh verses.

Solomon soon afterwards proceeded to Gibeon, "for that was the great high place," and offered one thousand burnt-offerings upon the brazen altar. At this time Gibeon was the proper place of worship, on account of the original tabernacle and altar made in the Wilderness being there deposited, and Solomon evinced a due sense of religion by considering it his first duty to address himself to God in prayer and sacrifice, in acknowledgment of the Divine favour which placed him on his father's throne. It has been objected to the statement of the thousand burnt-offerings, that such a number of beasts could not be consumed on the altar here mentioned, and within the period of such a festival: but this has been obviated by supposing that some of the sacrifices might be offered at Jerusalem as well as Gibeon; or that, although *one thousand* burnt-offerings are specifically mentioned, it is only necessary to understand some great and unusual number, as it is common with the sacred writers to denote any extraordinary number of things by a determinate sum. While at Gibeon, Jehovah appeared to him in a vision by night, and promised to grant him whatever he most valued and desired. Solomon, thus honoured by the God of Israel, entreated for wisdom to guide him in discharging the duties of his high office. "Thou hast showed," he said, "unto thy servant David my father great mercy (or *bounty*), according as he walked before thee in truth, and in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart with thee, and thou hast kept for him this great kindness, that thou hast given him a son to sit on his throne, as it is this day. And now, O Lord my God, thou hast made thy servant king instead of David my father: and I am but a little child; I know not how to go out or come

in. And thy servant is in the midst of thy people which thou hast chosen, a great people that cannot be numbered nor counted for multitude. Give, therefore, thy servant an understanding heart, to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad, for who is able to judge this so great a people?"

The statement, *I am but a little child*, must be understood as a reference by Solomon to his inexperience, and to his insufficiency for the onerous duties which devolved upon him. Josephus indeed tells us that he was only twelve years of age at this time, but Dr Hales and others have clearly shown by an analysis of the history, that he must have been eighteen if not twenty years of age when he ascended the throne. The succeeding clause, *to go out or come in*, is clearly, as a writer observes, a Hebraism common in the sacred writings, and seems here to refer to the condition of a young child unable to walk firmly and ignorant of every thing, such as Solomon professes himself to be as ruler of a great people. The young king asked for an *understanding heart*, and some Jewish commentators allege that though Solomon in his great modesty requested no more than the gift of government, Jehovah was pleased to bestow upon him a general knowledge of all other things. We cannot, however, suppose that, whatever knowledge Solomon might obtain by immediate inspiration from God, he would neglect those ordinary means of knowledge—study and observation. We are told by the son of Sirach that Jehovah "gave his heart to seek and search out all things under heaven," so that he endeavoured by application and experience to make as perfect as possible that wonderful faculty which he had so advantageously received.

This request of Solomon "pleased the Lord," and he was honoured with this Divine communication—"Because thou hast asked this thing, and hast not asked for thyself long life; neither hast asked riches for thyself, nor hast asked the life of thine enemies, but hast asked for thy-

self understanding to discern judgment : Behold, I have done according to thy words ; so, I have given thee a wise and understanding heart, so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee. And I have also given thee that which thou hast not asked, both riches and honour ; so that there shall not be any among the kings like unto thee all thy days. And if thou wilt walk in my ways, to keep my statutes and my commandments, as thy father David did walk, then I will lengthen thy days." Solomon awoke, and "behold it was a dream." This intimates that the impressions he had felt in his sleep still continued clear and vivid, which convinced him that it was a Divine vision, and not an ordinary dream.

The request of Solomon was fully granted. We are told that " God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea shore. And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt." It is doubted by commentators whether the Arabians, the Chaldeans, or the Persians, are indicated by the *children of the east country*. It is not necessary, however, to be very precise, and those three ancient nations were celebrated for their wisdom and learning. The country of the Arabs is not, strictly speaking, *east* from Canaan, and the Persians were too remote for their *wisdom* to be known to or appreciated by the sacred writers at this period. The country of the Chaldeans is usually understood as the *east country* of the Scriptures. Some think that the statement in the text intimates that Solomon's wisdom exceeded that of all persons who lived in the earlier times, and whose long lives were devoted and favourable to the acquisition of knowledge. The *wisdom of Egypt* is specially noticed, and it appears that among the Hebrews, as among the Greeks, the Egyptians were justly celebrated for their knowledge in science and art, and we find St Stephen speaking of Moses as " learn-

ed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." We are farther told that Solomon was " wiser than all men"—a statement which has induced some to think that he was the wisest man who ever lived or will yet live, and this is certainly warranted by the language of the Divine reply to his request ; but without this the context implies no more than that he was the wisest man of his own time. He was wiser than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol." Some of the Rabbins argue that the word rendered *men* in the foregoing text should be translated *Adam*, and that Ethan is Moses, Heman is Abraham, and Chalcol is Joseph ; but Josephus and Maimonides deny that Solomon was wiser than Moses, and contend that the persons named were eminent Hebrews living in the time of Solomon. We find an Ethan, who was author of the 89th Psalm, a Heman, who wrote the 88th Psalm, and two brothers, Chalcol and Darda, who were all the sons of Mahol, which may have been another name of Zerah, or understood as an appellative describing them as skilled in *Mahol*, which means *music* or *poetry*, or *of the choir*. Solomon spoke " three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five." The Book of Proverbs does not contain so many as three thousand, and there are some doubts as to the proportion which should be assigned to Solomon, though they all collectively bear his name ; but we may include the Book of Ecclesiastes, in which many sententious observations occur. Josephus extravagantly states that he wrote *three thousand books* of Proverbs. Of Solomon's " thousand and five" songs, we have only the Song of Songs remaining, unless we are to include the 45th and 127th Psalms as his composition. In the Septuagint the number given is *five thousand*. Solomon, moreover, " spake of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall ; he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." Josephus grave-

ly states that Solomon made every living creature and plant the subject of a parable. Whatever may have been the merits of these compositions on natural history they are all lost. It is certain that none of them were inspired writings.

After the transaction at Gibeon, and the vision which Solomon had seen there during the night, he returned to Jerusalem, and "stood before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings, and offered peace-offerings, and made a feast to all his servants." He soon had occasion to display his wisdom in deciding a dispute between two mothers, who claimed the same child. The sacred historian designates those women "harlots," but he probably means no more than that they kept houses of public entertainment, and the Jews suppose them to have been strangers. The story, as narrated by the inspired writer, is extremely interesting (Kings iii. 16-28), and the alarm of the mother, arising from the belief that Solomon would really kill the child, is of importance as an evidence of the despotic character of the authority wielded by the Hebrew kings. The Hebrew government was certainly not an *absolute despotism*, nor yet was it a *limited monarchy*. It was rather a *restricted despotism*, namely, it was restricted in some general matters, but absolute where such restrictions did not apply. Calmet mentions two examples illustrative of the celebrated *Judgment of Solomon*—one of the finest pictures of Rubens—the one from Suetonius, and the other from Diodorus Siculus, but one more immediately to the point is given by Mr Roberts in his *Oriental Illustrations*, taken from a Hindoo book. "A woman who was going to bathe left her child to play on the banks of a tank, when a female demon who was passing that way carried it off. They both appeared before the deity, and each declared the child was her own; the command was therefore given for each claimant to seize the infant by a leg and arm, and pull with all their might in opposite directions. No sooner had they com-

menced than the child began to scream, when the real mother from pity left off pulling, and resigned her claim to the other. The judge therefore decided that as she only had shown affection the child must be hers." We can solely understand the real character of Solomon's judgment in this transaction by a reference to the nature of Oriental despotism. In the East, where the great practical law is acknowledged that the king shall do as he pleases, there is no assurance that he will not do a barbarous action unless his private character for mildness and clemency is well known. On the present occasion we are told that "all Israel heard of the judgment which the king had judged, and they feared the king: for they saw that the wisdom of God was in him, to do judgment."

We now find Solomon arranging the affairs of his household and his court, which he did on the most extensive scale. He appointed "twelve officers, who provided victuals for the king and his household." This number had no reference to the tribes, but simply to the months of the year, as we are told that "each man his month in a year made provision." From the narrative it appears that the taxes due to the state were chiefly paid in the produce of the soil—a practice still continued to some extent in the East. Solomon divided his dominions into twelve governments or districts, each of which was to provide for the maintenance of the king's household one month, and the presiding officer was empowered to collect this revenue, and to transmit it to Jerusalem. The surplus might enable the officer of the district to support his own establishment, and we are entitled to infer, from the rank of the persons employed, that the preferment was considered valuable and honourable. One of them, named Ahimaaz, married Basmath the daughter of Solomon, and another, whose name is not given, and who is simply called the "son of Abinadab, or Ben-Abinadab," married Tiphath, another of the king's daughters. There can be little doubt, from the very premature

manner in which the statements respecting Solomon's governors are introduced, that the chapter which contains them (1 Kings iv.) is out of chronological order, and if this be the fact all these statements must be anticipatory, for Solomon could not possibly at this period (B. C. 1014, according to the Bible chronology) have had marriageable daughters. It may be assumed, therefore, that this account, like that of Solomon's songs, proverbs, and works on natural history, at the end of the chapter, simply details what ultimately took place. These daughters of Solomon, however, according to the Oriental custom, might have been *betrothed* to their husbands long before the marriageable age, and consequently they would be considered as their legal wives.

The districts into which Solomon divided his dominions, and superintended by his twelve governors, were—1. Mount Ephraim. 2. Shaaibim, Bethshemesh, and Elon-beth-hanan. 3. Aruboth, Socloah, and all the land of Hephher. 4. Dor. 5. Taanach and Megiddo, and "all Bethshean, which is by Zartanah beneath Jezreel, from Beth-shean to Abel-meholah, even unto the place that is beyond Jokneam." 6. Ramoth-Gilead, including the towns of Jair, the son of Manasseh, the region of Argob "which is in Bashan, threescore great cities with walls and brazen bars." 7. Malianaim. 8. Naphtali. 9. Asher and Aloth. 10. Issachar. 11. Benjamin. 12. The country of Gilead "in the country of Sihon, king of the Amorites, and of Og, king of Bashan." This government was held by Geber, the son of Uri, and "he was the only officer in the land," which means that he was the sole and only governor of that extensive region, which was much larger than the other districts. Some of the proper names of the governors are not given. They are simply styled the *son of Hur*, or *Ben-Hur*, the *son of Dekar*, or *Ben-Dekar*, the *son of Hessed*, or *Ben-Hessed*, the *son of Abinadab*, or *Ben-Abinadab*, the *son of Geber*, or *Ben-Geber*. All these persons are named after their fathers, according to a custom among the

Hebrews still observed by the Arabs, whose sons often take their fathers' names with the prefix *ben*, or *son*, neglecting or dropping their own names. This often occurs in the East, where surnames are unknown, and the intelligent reader will at once trace several analogies to this custom in our own country. It was indeed in all probability the origin of surnames in Europe. The Hebrews, however, more commonly annexed their father's name to their own, which was necessary to distinguish individuals in a country where thousands of persons of all ranks were called by the same name, and they were then designated either by their own full name or by its component parts. Here, too, we could produce numerous analogies in our own country, and also show that this is the present usage of the Arabs. King David, for example, is generally called by his own proper name, but sometimes also *Ben-Jesse*, the *son of Jesse*; and at other times *David-ben-Jesse*, or *David the son of Jesse*. We are farther told by the inspired historian that "Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea in multitude, eating and drinking, and making merry." This intimates that not only was there a great and increasing population, but that the people lived in plenty and security, in prosperity and peace, and satisfied with their situation. Moreover, Solomon "reigned over all kingdoms from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt; they brought presents, and served Solomon, all the days of his life." The boundaries of Solomon's kingdom, as Stackhouse observes, were "the Euphrates to the east, that river being here, as in other places of Scripture, called *the river* by way of eminence, without any addition,—the country of the Philistines, which bordered on the Mediterranean Sea, to the west—and Egypt to the south; so that he had tributary to him Syria, Damascus, Moab, and Ammon, which are between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean."

The great officers of state, if we may so designate them, in addition to the

governors of the provinces, were, 1. Asariah, the son of Zadok the priest. As he is first mentioned, he was in all probability *vizier* or prime minister, and he is in the original called the chief officer. Although he is called the *son of Zadok*, we learn from another passage (1 Chron. vi. 8, 9) that he was the son of Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, and therefore Zadok's *grandson*, but it is well known that grandsons are frequently called *sons* in Scripture. 2. Elihoreph and Ahiah, the sons of Shisha, who were the *scribes*, as they are designated, or *secretaries*. 3. Jehoshaphat, the son of Ahilud, was *recorder*, or remembrancer. 4. Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, a distinguished warrior, and one of David's "mighty men of valour," was "over the host," namely, he commanded the Hebrew army. 5. Azariah, the son of Nathan the Prophet, who had been Solomon's preceptor, was "over the officers." 6. Zabud, another son of Nathan, or of a person so called, was "principal officer, and the king's friend." 7. Abishar was over the *household*; and, 8. Adoniram, the son of Abda, was over the *tribute*. The duties of some of these officers, such as Benaiah, who was "over the host," are obvious; those of the others are not so clear, but an explanation and illustration of them would occasion a long though by no means uninteresting digression. The *king's friend* is an office peculiar to the courts of the Oriental monarchs. Zadok and Abiathar are recorded as the *priests*, which intimates that the latter was permitted to retain the title of high priest, after he had ceased to discharge the functions of his office. It is the conjecture of some commentators that latterly Abiathar was allowed to come to Jerusalem and officiate when Zadok was necessarily absent, but this is a mere opinion unsupported by any evidence. "It is matter of doubt with commentators," says Bishop Patrick, "whether this is the same Abiathar whom Solomon ejected from the office of high priest. If he is the same, he was probably suffered to retain the name and title of high priest, while Zadok enjoyed the office, and perhaps

occasionally to minister, or perhaps he is here mentioned because in the beginning of Solomon's reign he discharged the office of high priest."

We are farther told that "Solomon's provision for one day was thirty measures of fine flour, and threescore measures of meal." The *provision* here mentioned means *bread* of all kinds, and the *meal* is common flour, so called to distinguish it from fine flour. The quantity of daily consumpt is estimated to be about four hundred and eighty bushels of meal, or common flour, and two hundred and forty of fine flour. Solomon farther required for the daily use of his household "ten fat oxen, and twenty oxen out of the pastures, and an hundred sheep, beside harts, and roebucks, and fallowdeer, and fatted fowl." These statements are apt to surprise any one who is ignorant of the extent and arrangement of Oriental courts, and of the vast number of persons, male and female, which the royal establishments support. The Prophet Samuel makes an allusion to this in his declaration to the Israelites of their condition under the monarchy they so earnestly demanded. The king "will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers." But to illustrate this part of the inspired historian's narrative more forcibly, and to show that it is quite in unison with the establishments of subsequent Oriental monarchs, the daily consumption of provisions in the court and household of Cyrus is submitted to the reader. The account is long, and some of the particulars are obscure, but the most conspicuous details are upwards of one thousand bushels of various quantities of wheat, and the same of what may be termed barley-meal, four hundred sheep, three hundred lambs, one hundred oxen, thirty horses, thirty deer, four hundred fat geese, one hundred goslings, three hundred doves, six hundred small birds, three thousand seven hundred and fifty gallons of wine, one half palm wine, and the other half grape wine, seventy-five gallons of new milk, and seventy-five gallons of sour milk—the last mentioned commodity being greatly

prised in the East. Besides this extraordinary consumption, the details of which were found by Alexander the Great inscribed on a brazen pillar at Persepolis, there are intimations of a vast quantity of corn and other commodities doled out as gifts, or allowed for the food of cattle. The authenticity of this account cannot of course be guaranteed, but it is confirmed by the statements of Athenæus in his Thirteenth Book respecting the number of cooks, confectioners, wine-servers, and others, who attended Darius, king of Persia, in the camp, and who were taken prisoners by Parmenio at Damascus. It is farther confirmed by the statements of the inspired historian, and by the existing state of things in the East. But the reader will more easily understand the Scripture account of Solomon's establishment, and the provisions required for the numerous persons composing his household, by a perusal of Tavernier's account of the imperial kitchens in the Grand Seigneur's seraglio in the seventeenth century. He enumerates seven kitchens in his excellent and graphic description, where provisions are prepared for as many distinct departments of the household, and then proceeds—"There enters no beef into the kitchens of the seraglio, but the *ordinary consumption of every day*, including all, as well those who eat within as without, may amount to *five hundred sheep*, in which number must be comprehended lambs and kids; and the greatest part of those sheep are brought from the frontiers of Persia, which country excels all others as to that creature. According to this proportion of mutton may be computed the quantity of pullets, chickens, and young pigeons, the number whereof is limited according to the seasons, as also what may be consumed in rice and butter for the *pilace*, which is accounted the best dish in Turkey, and all over the East. The offices where the conserves and sweetmeats are made, there being six or seven of them, are above the kitchens, and served by *four hundred Halcagu*. They are perpetually at work

in these seven offices, and there they prepare all sorts of conserves, dry and liquid, and several sorts of syrups." Other illustrations could be easily added, but the statements now quoted will lessen our wonder at the extraordinary consumption of Solomon's household.

The inspired historian farther intimates, that Solomon had "forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen." In the parallel passage (2 Chron. ix. 25), the number is stated at *four thousand*, which is supposed to relate to the *stalls* or *stables* only, while the number quoted, *forty thousand*, relates to the horses contained in them. It is alleged, however, that the Hebrew word rendered *forty* can also be translated *four*, so that the disagreement of the two statements is of little consequence. The most important thing to be noticed is, that an establishment of horses was directly contrary to the Mosaic Law (Deut. xvii. 16), which prohibited the *multiplying* of horses, chiefly on religious considerations, and to prevent any intimate intercourse with Egypt. When Solomon violated this injunction of the Law, and "multiplied" horses to the number here stated—and it matters not whether we read *four thousand* or *forty thousand*, it was soon attended with the fatal consequences which had been distinctly predicted by Moses. It is observed by Pyle—"In excuse for Solomon having so great a number of war horses, contrary to the Law, it is alleged that he kept them, not out of pride or vanity, but merely as a necessary guard to his kingdom against the incursions of the Philistines. Perhaps, however, though this account is given in the beginning of his reign, it refers to what took place towards the latter parts of it, so that it may have been as great a fault in him to multiply horses as to multiply wives and concubines, both being done at the same time, and prohibited in the same Law." The latter supposition of the learned writer is to be preferred to the former. Solomon had nothing to fear from the Philistines, or any other

people, as long as he "walked in the ways, and kept the statutes and commandments" of Jehovah—a fact which had been communicated to him in the divine vision shortly after his accession.

The truth seems to be, that Solomon fell into all the luxuries and extravagancies of the ancient Oriental monarchs, many of whom in subsequent times made him their model, and imitated his splendour. Hence we find that horses have been always considered a necessary adjunct of a royal or noble establishment in the East. Tavernier has a passage in his "Relation of the Grand Seigneur's Seraglio," which illustrates these observations—"On the left hand, in the same court, and opposite the kitchens, may be seen the Grand Seigneur's *little stables*, which do not hold above twenty-five or thirty choice horses, designed for his exercises with his favourites, and above the stables, in great rooms, they keep the saddles, bridles, trappings, foot-cloths, and stirrups, which are of inestimable value, by reason of the abundance of precious stones whereby they are enriched. The great stables stand all along the canal which beats against the walls of the seraglio. They are always well replenished, and in good order, and they take care that there shall not be so much as one vacant place therein. In those stables does the Grand Seigneur keep a great number of horses of value, to be reserved for the war, or to be used in some magnificent solemnity, that strangers may see the splendour of the court."

We are informed by the sacred historian that the officers "provided victual for King Solomon, and for all that came unto King Solomon's table, every man in his month; they lacked nothing. Barley also and straw for the horses and dromedaries brought they unto the place where the officers were, every man according to his charge." It may be here observed, that *barley* is the usual food of the Oriental horses, with some exceptions arising from local circumstances. The two-humped camel, commonly called a dromedary, is not found in Syria or Arabia,

and is certainly not the animal intended in the original text. The marginal reading gives *mules*. The Hebrew word, says Parkhurst, seems to mean in general *working cattle*, or cattle employed in labour. But the most remarkable intimation in the whole statement is, that Solomon's officers, "every man in his month, lacked nothing." By this we are to understand that those functionaries rigidly exacted the tribute, which was often paid with great reluctance, and it was indeed one of the ostensible reasons for separation and independence urged by the Ten Tribes at the accession of Solomon's son, Rehoboam. Although the Hebrews were great and prosperous during the reign of this distinguished monarch, they were nevertheless sorely oppressed, or rather annoyed, by heavy tributes or taxes, to defray the vast expenses of the royal establishments, and the buildings erected by the king. We are indeed told that "Judah and Israel dwelt safely [or *confidently*] every man under his vine and under his fig-tree, from Dan even to Beersheba, all the days of Solomon," but this is evidently no more than a beautiful figurative expression, implying that the Hebrews were in the habit of planting trees and training vines near their houses. The narrative of the revolt at the accession of Rehoboam clearly proves that, notwithstanding the greatness and prosperity of the Hebrew nation under Solomon, they submitted to a severe despotism—that he literally, as the disaffected tribes complained to his son and successor, made their "yoke heavy," and "chastised them with whips." Mr Morier mentions some particulars which admirably illustrate the proceedings of Solomon's officers, and by way of analogy give us an explanation of the motives which influenced the Ten Tribes to revolt. Our traveller refers to Persia—a country which has undergone little change in the peculiar manners and customs of its people for some thousands of years. "On the road," says Mr Morier, "we overtook a Persian family journeying from their village near Sha-

pour, for the express purpose of consulting the surgeon of the Embassy in the hope that he might cure the grandfather of the family, who had been long afflicted with swelled glands. The grandson, a fine youth of about eighteen, accosted us. We asked him what he paid yearly to the government in the way of tribute or tax. 'Yearly,' said he, 'why, we pay monthly, and frequently twice a month.'—'And upon what objects are the taxes levied?'—'Upon every thing that we possess,' added he, 'and when they can find nothing else to tax, they tax our children.'" Mr Morier also tells us of a certain *Meh-mander*—a fair specimen of persons of his rank and employment, who "forced from the poor women wherewith to feed ourselves and our cattle, and not content with that, he persisted in raising forty tomans in cash, the sum assigned to him as his own perquisite, a sort of *tooth-money*, upon each village at which in his firman it was directed that we should stop. This demand created great lamentation among the women, and brought them in crowds out of their houses, beating their heads, and lifting their hands to the skies. What the *Meh-mander* could not get in money he took in kind; his men carried forcibly away what little furniture the poor creatures had left, at the same time using the stick against them without remorse." Mr Morier adds in a note—"Lady Mary Wortley Montague, in speaking of the Bashaws when they travel in Turkey, says—'These oppressors are not content with eating all that is to be eaten belonging to the peasants. After they have crammed themselves and their numerous retinue, they have the impudence to exact what they call *tooth-money*—a contribution for the use of their teeth, worn with doing them the honour of devouring their meat.'"

Solomon at the commencement of his reign may be truly said to have been in "all his glory." He had "dominion on this side the river [Euphrates] from Tiphseh [Thapsacus] even to Azzah [Gaza], over all the kings on this side

the river; and he had peace on all sides round about him." Moreover, "there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom." In addition to what the inspired historian here states, 'Josephus thinks proper to supply us with some additional information respecting Solomon's admitted knowledge and talents. "God also enabled him," he gravely writes, "to learn that skill which expels demons—a science useful and sanative to man. He composed such incantations also by which distempers are alleviated; and he left behind him the manner of using exorcisms, by which they drive away demons, so that they never return. This method of cure is of great force unto this day, for I have seen a certain man of my own country, whose name was Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal, in the presence of Vespasian and his sons, and his captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. The manner of the cure was this: He put a ring, which had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon, to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon *through his nostrils*, and when the man fell down immediately, he adjured him to return into him no more, making still mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. When Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off a cup or bason full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man, to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man; and when this was done, the skill and wisdom of Solomon was shown very manifestly, for which reason it is that all men may know the vastness of Solomon's abilities, and how he was beloved of God; and that the extraordinary virtues of every kind with which this king was endowed may not be unknown to any people under the sun. For this reason it is that we have proceeded to speak so largely of these matters.'" Mr Whiston

remarks on this singular passage—"Some pretended fragments of these books of conjuration by Solomon are still extant in Fabricius [*Codex Pseudegraphus Veteris Testamentis collectus*, Hamburg, 1713], though I entirely differ from Josephus in this his supposal, that such books and arts of Solomon were parts of that wisdom which was imparted to him by God in his younger days. They must rather have belonged to such profane but curious arts, as we find mentioned, Acts xix. 13-20, and had been derived from the idolatry and superstition of his heathen wives and concubines in his old age, when he had forsaken God, and God had forsaken him, and given him up to demoniacal delusions."

Solomon now directed his energies to the erection of that great work with which his name is imperishably associated—the Temple of Jerusalem. He had already extended the walls of Jerusalem, and made them stronger than before, and it appears (Psalm li. 18) that this was one of the objects in which his father David interested himself. The reader will also recollect that David intended to build the Temple, and that he received a Divine intimation to desist, for the reasons expressly given by the sacred historian. That honour was reserved for Solomon, whose reign was to be one of peace, and therefore a reign appropriate for the erection of the "house of the Lord." It appears that among the kings who courted the friendship of Solomon, the celebrated Hiram, king of Tyre, was most conspicuous. He had been a faithful ally of his father, "for Hiram was ever a lover of David," and shortly after Solomon's accession he sent an embassy of congratulation to Jerusalem, requesting the young king to renew and continue the treaty which had been maintained by him and his father. Solomon received the ambassadors in the most friendly manner, and as he was at that time planning the erection of the Temple, he embraced the opportunity to commence a correspondence with the king of Tyre respecting his projected magni-

ficent edifice. His letter to Hiram is preserved by the inspired writer. "Thou knowest how that David my father could not build an house unto the name of the Lord his God for the wars which were about him on every side, until the Lord put them under the soles of his feet. But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither adversary nor evil occurrent. And behold, I purpose to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God, as the Lord spake unto David my father, saying, Thy son, whom I will set on the throne in thy room, he shall build an house unto my name. Now, therefore, command thou that they may hew me cedar-trees out of Lebanon; and my servants shall be with thy servants; and unto thee will I give hire for thy servants, according to all that thou shalt appoint; for thou knowest that there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like unto the Sidonians." Hiram received the royal letter with the greatest delight, and expressed himself in language which evinces that he was acquainted with the true worship of Jehovah. He "rejoiced greatly," and exclaimed, "Blessed be the Lord this day, which hath given unto David a wise son over this great people." His answer to Solomon is also recorded. "I have considered (or *heard*) the things which thou sentest to me for, and I will do all thy desire concerning timber of cedar, and concerning timber of fir. My servants shall bring them down from Lebanon unto the sea [the Mediterranean]; and I will convey them by sea in floats unto the place that thou shalt appoint me, and will cause them to be discharged there, and thou shalt receive them; and thou shalt accomplish my desire, in giving food for my household." The last sentence of this letter is explained by what immediately follows—"And Solomon gave Hiram twenty thousand measures of wheat for food to his household, and twenty measures of pure oil; thus gave Solomon to Hiram year by year." It is stated in the parallel passage (2 Chron. ii

10) that Solomon was to give "twenty thousand measures of beaten wheat, and twenty thousand measures of barley, and twenty thousand baths of wine, and twenty thousand baths of oil." In all probability some of the numbers here given are mistaken by transcribers. The quantity to be sent at one time is enormous, and we may perhaps infer that Solomon sent it by portions during the seven years of the building of the Temple. The provision mentioned, however, may be that made by Solomon for the workmen, and distinct from the remuneration to Hiram for the services of his subjects.

In the Second Book of the Chronicles the letter of Solomon and the reply of Hiram are somewhat different, and contain various minute particulars. Among others we find Solomon requesting his friendly ally to send him "a man cunning to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in iron, and in purple, and in crimson, and blue, and that can skill to grave with the cunning men that are with me in Judah and in Jerusalem, whom David did provide." In reply to this Hiram says—"I have sent a cunning man, endued with understanding, of Huram [or Hiram] my father's, the son of a woman of the daughters of Dan, and his father was a man of Tyre, skilful to work in gold, and in silver, in brass, in iron, in stone, and in timber, in purple, in blue, and in fine linen, and in crimson; also to grave any manner of graving, and to find out every device which shall be put to him, with thy cunning men, and with the cunning men of my lord David thy father." Josephus gives us different versions of the letter and the reply, which are evidently no other than his own phraseology, though he tells us—"The copies of these epistles remain at this day, and are preserved not only in our books, but among the Tyrians also, inasmuch that if any one would know the certainty about them, he may desire the keeper of the public records of Tyre to show him them, and he will find what is there set down to agree with what we have said." Whiston, his translator,

remarks on this statement, which is very apocryphal so far as it refers to the existence of the original documents, which the Jewish historian intimates he had himself seen—"What Josephus here puts into his copy of Hiram's epistle to Solomon, and repeats afterwards, that Tyre was now *an island*, is not in any of the three other copies, namely, that of the Kings, the Chronicles, or Eusebius, nor is it in any other, I suppose, than his own conjectural paraphrase; for when I many years ago inquired into the matter, I found the state of this famous city, and of the island whereupon it stood, to have been very different at different times. The result of my inquiries in this matter, with the addition of some later improvements, stands thus—that the best testimonies hereto relating imply that Palæ-Tyrus, or oldest Tyre, was no other than that most ancient smaller fort or city Tyre, situated on the continent, and mentioned in Joshua (xix. 29), out of which the Canaanite or Phœnician inhabitants were driven into a large island that lay not far off in the sea by Joshua—that the island was then joined to the continent, as the present remains of Palæ-Tyrus, by a neck of land over against Solomon's Cisterns, still so called,—and the city's fresh water probably was carried along in pipes by that neck of land—and that this island was therefore in strictness no other than a peninsula, having *villages in the fields* (Ezek. xxvi. 6) and a *wall* about it (Amos i. 10), and the city was not of so great reputation as Sidon for some ages." These and the other observations of the learned translator are confirmed by the examinations of recent travellers, and there is therefore no warrant for the concluding sentence of Josephus' version of Hiram's letter to Solomon—"Do thou take care to provide us corn for this number, which we stand in need of, *because we inhabit an island*."

The timber required was conveyed from the high parts of Lebanon either to the river anciently called Adonis, or to the plain of Byblos, and thence to the

sea, where all the trees were placed on rafts and conveyed to Joppa, which was then the nearest sea-port to Jerusalem. It is to be observed that Lebanon, or at least a considerable part of that celebrated mountainous range, was within the dominions of Solomon, so that he did not request the trees from Hiram, but merely assistance in cutting them down and preparing them for use, which was better understood by the Tyrians and Sidonians than by the Israelites. There had been several ingenious workmen among the Hebrews in the time of Moses, but we are expressly informed that they acquired their skill under the Divine guidance, and it does not appear that they had any successors. After the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan, as Bishop Patrick appropriately observes, they seem to have paid no regard to the arts, and to have devoted themselves entirely to agriculture, so that in the time of Solomon there were no professed "cunning men" who could undertake the work of the Temple. On the other hand, the ancient Tyrians and Sidonians were always celebrated for their skill, and Homer describes them as "excellent artists in several kinds of wood." It is doubtful whether Solomon could have completed his work without foreign assistance.

To enter into all the minute particulars respecting the celebrated Temple of Jerusalem erected by Solomon would extend the present work far beyond its proposed limits. Referring the reader, therefore, to the narratives of the inspired historians and Josephus, we merely touch on such points as illustrate the reign of Solomon, and the condition of the Hebrews as a great and powerful nation at that time. In the parallel account in the Second Book of Chronicles we are told that "Solomon numbered all the strangers that were in the land of Israel, after the numbering wherewith David his father had numbered them, and they were found an hundred and fifty thousand, and three thousand and six hundred. And he set threescore and ten thousand to be bearers

of burdens, and fourscore thousand to be hewers in the mountain, and three thousand and six hundred overseers to set the people at work." These *strangers*, as they are significantly called, were the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, whom the Israelites had not been able "utterly to destroy," and "upon these did Solomon levy a tribute of bond-service," but "of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bondmen," 1 Kings ix. 20-22. It is not likely that he could have done so, even if he had been inclined, although we read in a previous passage, 1 Kings v. 13, that he raised a levy of thirty thousand Israelites commanded by Adoniram, who served in alternate monthly courses, and were doubtless amply remunerated for their labours. In all this there is no disguising the features of Oriental despotism which Solomon began early to exhibit, and this was perhaps as far as he could go with the Israelites. He required assistance for this and his other great undertakings, and he procured it probably in a compulsory manner, yet in accordance with the customs of the East, from those people not Israelites who were tributary and tolerated in Canaan, whose services he was entitled to demand. They would in consequence of their personal services be exempted from the money tribute, receive their food, and a small allowance of wages while at work, for it is likely that they were not kept at constant labour, but were divided into companies who served alternately. This procedure of Solomon could be illustrated by numerous examples from ancient history and the existing practices of the East, and even in European countries there are instances of compulsory services required by sovereigns not only from the remnant of a conquered population, but even from their own peasantry. One of the best illustrations of Solomon's conduct occurs in the case of Mehemet Ali, the Pacha of Egypt, as related by Mr Carne in his "Letters from the East." Fortunately, too, the coincidence is remarkable, as it describes one of Mehemet's

important undertakings. "The great canal of Cleopatra, which he has lately made, or rather revived, forty miles in length, connecting the Nile with the sea at Alexandria, is an extraordinary work. For a considerable time he employed a *hundred and fifty thousand men* about it, chiefly *Arabs of Upper Egypt*; of these twenty thousand died during the progress of the work. Having ridden out early one morning in the neighbourhood of the city, and entered an elegant house which Ali was building for his son, we suddenly heard the sounds of music from without, and perceived it was the Pacha himself, with his guard, who had just arrived from Cairo. He was on foot, and stood on the lofty bank of a new canal he was making, earnestly observing the innumerable workmen beneath. The bed of the canal below presented a novel spectacle, being filled with vast numbers of *Arabs of various colours* working in the intense heat of the day, while their Egyptian taskmasters, with whips in their hands, watched the progress of their labour. It was a just and lively representation of the children of Israel forced to toil by their oppressive masters of old. The wages Mehemet allowed these unfortunate people, whom he had obliged to quit their homes and families in Upper Egypt to toil about this work, were only *a penny a-day and a ration of bread*; yet such is the buoyancy of the Arabs, that they go through their heavy toil with gaiety and cheerfulness." As Mr Carne alludes to the Israelites in the preceding extract, it may be here noticed that they experienced the hardness of compulsory service in Egypt, and complained of it not merely as *bondage*, but as *hard bondage*. If the Israelites in Solomon's time should be accused of imposing upon others what their ancestors justly felt to be a bitter grievance in the time of Moses, it must be recollected that they were in Egypt an independent people, and ought to have been treated as such—that they were neither native, conquered, nor tributary—that they were not even a settled peasantry cultivating the grounds, but a

free pastoral people, and from such no ruler in the East ever thinks of requiring compulsory personal services, whatever tribute he may levy upon their flocks and cattle.

Bishop Patrick conjectures that the Amorites, Hittites, and others employed or compelled by Solomon to render their personal services in the building of the Temple, were not idolaters, for if they had been so it is likely that David would have expelled them; but that they were worshippers of the true God, though not admitted to the privileges of the chosen people. Solomon, adds the learned writer, numbered them on this occasion—"after the numbering wherewith David had numbered them," that he might know their strength and condition, not from motives of vanity and ostentation, but from a prudent care that he might distinguish them from the Jews, and that he might employ them in such parts of his works as he did not or could not assign to his own people. He had "four-score thousand hewers in the mountains," namely, hewers of stone, for Hiram's servants cut down the timber. If it appear strange that such a vast number of men were employed about the erection of a building comparatively so small as the Temple, it must be recollected that the custom is quite Oriental, and we simply refer the reader to the passage from Mr Carne's Letters from the East, in which we find the Pacha of Egypt compelling the personal services of 150,000 men in digging a canal. It should also be remembered that there were many other great works which Solomon designed and finished, and for which we read of no other preparations than those now made. The inspired historian informs us in another place—"And this is the reason of the levy which Solomon raised, for to build the house of the Lord, and his own house, and Millo, and the wall of Jerusalem, and Hazor, and Megiddo, and Gezer. For Pharaoh, king of Egypt, had gone up, and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it for a pre-

went unto his daughter, Solomon's wife." We are farther informed that, besides rebuilding Gezer, Solomon built "Beth-horon the Nether, and Baalath, and Tadmor in the Wilderness, in the land. And all the cities of store which Solomon had, and cities for his chariots, and cities for his horsemen, and that which Solomon desired to build in Jerusalem, and in Lebanon, and in all the land of his dominion." These extensive repairs and erections would necessarily require a vast number of persons in constant operation. In the First Book of Kings (v. 16) it is stated that there were *three thousand and three hundred overseers*, but in the parallel passage (2 Chron. ii. 18) the number given is *three thousand six hundred*. The additional three hundred were probably superior officers, who were superintendents of the others.

The workmen "brought great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones, to lay the foundation of the house: and Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders did hew them, and the stone-squarers." These intimations of ancient masonry are interesting. In the treaty with Hiram, as given in the First Book of Kings and the Second Book of Chronicles, nothing is said of stones or their conveyance, which must have caused prodigious labour and expense if they were brought from quarries at Lebanon, and Josephus omits them in his version of the treaty. The text seems to intimate that the timber only was brought from Lebanon, and that wherever the stone was obtained it was hewn by the assistance of Hiram's workmen. Josephus says that the stone with which Solomon's Temple was built was "white stone," and Shaw describes the stone of those regions as hard, calcareous, whitish, sonorous like freestone, and disposed in strata variously inclined. Good stone of this kind could have been found much nearer than Lebanon, but there they might have obtained immense blocks and masses loosened in the course of time by earthquakes and frosts, and thrown down into the valleys. On the present occasion, wherever the quarries

were, they were squared and made ready at the places where they were procured, which would greatly facilitate their removal to Jerusalem. This we learn from another passage (1 Kings vi. 7), where it is stated—"And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the house while it was building." As to the *largeness* of the stones, as intimated by the sacred writer, travellers who have examined the remains of the ancient structures of Syria bear testimony to the astonishing size of some of the stones.

It is unnecessary to enter into a long description of the Temple. We adopt Mr Horne's observation—"Various attempts have been made to describe the proportions and several parts of this structure, but as scarcely any two writers agree on this subject a minute description of it is designedly omitted." The best idea of it would be formed from instituting an analogy with other ancient temples, such as those in Egypt and at Palmyra, otherwise Tadmor in the Wilderness, or that at Baalbec in Cælo-Syria, between Libanus and Anti-Libanus, which the Orientals firmly believe was built by Solomon. The author of "Egyptian Antiquities" observes—"It is rather remarkable that Solomon, who was connected with the Egyptians both by marriage, alliance, and commercial exchange, should have borrowed artificers and cunning workmen solely from his friend Hiram, king of Tyre, and not from his father-in-law, the king of Egypt. Even the house which Solomon built for his Egyptian wife appears to have been altogether the work of Tyrian architects; yet we have undoubted evidence, in the buildings and decorations of the Egyptian temples, that they possessed at that time the arts, in at least as high a state of perfection as any thing that Tyre was likely to produce. It may be remarked, however, that many of the ornamental parts of Solomon's buildings resembled the decorations of an Egyptian edifice, and it

is therefore by no means improbable that Egyptian artisans were employed by him, though there is no distinct mention of the fact."

The Temple was begun in the fourth year of Solomon's reign, and in the year B.C. 1012, according to the Hebrew chronology. Josephus says that it was begun in the fourth year of the king's reign, in "the second month, which the Hebrews call *Jar*, five hundred and ninety-two years after the exodus out of Egypt;" but the sacred historian dates it in the "four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of Egypt." Some have asked why Solomon did not begin the work immediately at the commencement of his reign in obedience to the command of his father, but it may be reasonably conceded that the first four years would be spent in procuring the materials, and in making the necessary preparations. While Solomon was laying the foundations of the edifice, and making the groundwork of the building firm and strong, Jehovah conveyed a divine intimation to him that he was not to presume upon its duration unless he and the Israelites continued in obedience; and that he had rather not proceed in the work unless he sincerely meant to respect the laws and commandments of the invisible King. The whole structure was finished in the eleventh year of his reign; "in the month *Bul*, which is the eighth month, was the house finished throughout all the parts thereof, and according to all the fashion of it; so was he seven years in building it." He was literally seven years and six months in building the Temple, but the half year is omitted to express the time in round numbers. "This building of the Temple," says Dr Hales, "was a work of extraordinary despatch, if we consider its magnitude, variety, and minuteness. The summit of the rocky limestone of Moriah was first to be levelled, and hollows and inequalities to be filled up, in order to form a sufficient area or platform for the Temple itself, its courts, porticoes, and surrounding offices, which altogether com-

posed a prodigious pile of building, the most splendid and magnificent perhaps that the world ever saw—worthy of the Divine architect who planned, and of the wise and opulent prince who executed it." The piety of Solomon probably induced him to hasten the work, for we find that he took his own time to build his palace, which occupied him thirteen years. It appears that besides the important services rendered by Hiram he was of essential use in other respects. He furnished Solomon "with gold according to all his desire," and had sent to him "six score talents of gold." This intimates that the friendly king of Tyre was a prince of immense wealth, and the large sum mentioned was probably sent to Solomon to complete his various undertakings. Notwithstanding the king's prodigious income, his expensive establishments and magnificent works may at times have compelled him to feel the need of such assistance as Hiram afforded. In gratitude for all his important services Solomon presented Hiram with twenty cities in the Land of Galilee. These were not within the boundaries of the Tribes, because the Land of Promise, being the gift of Jehovah to his people, could not be alienated, but were cities conquered by David, though inhabited by Israelites. Josephus says that they lay not far from Tyre. When Hiram went to inspect them personally wherever they were situated, they "pleased him not," and he refused the offer, bestowing upon them the designation of *Cabal*, which, according to Josephus, in the Phœnician language signifies *displeasing*. The real cause of Hiram's dislike is not mentioned, and there is no express reason given for his refusal of what Solomon evidently considered a liberal offering. Perhaps the towns were intended as part payment of what Solomon was indebted to Hiram for his valuable services and contributions, or probably Hiram, who reigned over a maritime and commercial people, would have rather preferred a part of the coast, which Solomon had it not in his power to give.

Whatever ceremonies may have been performed at the laying of the foundation, the dedication of the Temple was a solemn and magnificent affair. The priests took the ark, and carried it from Mount Zion to the Temple on Mount Moriah, where it was deposited in the new edifice. This solemn removal of the ark from Mount Zion to Mount Moriah, at the distance of almost three quarters of a mile, confutes the notion of some modern Jews, followed by many Christians, that these two were in some degree one and the same mountain. All the "elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the fathers," assembled at Jerusalem in the month Ethanim, to celebrate the feast of the dedication of their magnificent national edifice. A full account of it is given in the First Book of Kings and the Second Book of Chronicles, to which the reader is referred. Solomon addressed a prayer on the occasion to Jehovah, remarkable for its fervent piety and deep devotional feeling. In a kneeling posture he spread out his hands and earnestly implored the divine blessing on the Israelites,—that Jehovah would be with them in all their undertakings,—that he would forgive all their transgressions and offences—and that he would evermore protect and prosper them as his peculiar and chosen people. The month in which this solemn dedication was made was that on which the Feast of Tabernacles was held, when vast numbers of persons resorted to Jerusalem from all parts of the kingdom. There was an interval of eleven months between the completion of the Temple and its dedication, but this interval may have been required for putting the edifice in proper order, and for clearing away the rubbish. A sacrifice of peace-offerings followed the dedication—"two and twenty thousand oxen, and an hundred and twenty thousand sheep," not all in one day, nor yet on one altar, but during the whole festival, which lasted fourteen days, and apparently included the period for the Feast of Tabernacles. It is stated—"On the eighth day he sent

the people away, and they blessed (or *thanked*) the king, and went into their tents, joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord had done for David his servant, and for Israel his people." In the parallel passage (2 Chron. vii. 10) it is added that this was the twenty-third day of the seventh month. It thus appears that the fourteen days of the feast were not all kept successively, for the great day of Expiation was on the tenth of this month. It is probable, therefore, that before this day the seven days of the dedication were kept, and that afterwards they rested till the fifteenth day of the month, when the Feast of Tabernacles began, so that the whole festival, or rather series of festivals, ended on the twenty-third day of the month.

When Solomon had finished the Temple, his palaces, and all his "desire which he was pleased to do," Jehovah appeared to him a second time in a vision, "as He had appeared to him in Gibeon." It was announced to him that his prayer at the dedication of the Temple had been graciously accepted. "I have hallowed this house which thou hast built," said Jehovah to him, "to put my name there for ever; and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually." The great God of heaven and earth, the Invisible King of the chosen people, thus condescended to speak of himself in the language of men, that his viceroy might properly understand his intimations. A peculiarly solemn warning was at the same time given to Solomon, in which it was pointedly enforced, that the happiness of the king and his people depended solely on their obedience to the laws of God. The whole was conditional, as are all the blessings which men can expect, whether temporal or spiritual, from the Almighty, and the rewards or punishments certain to follow whatever conduct was pursued were plainly set before Solomon. "If thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have commanded thee, and wilt keep my statutes and my judgments,

then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom for ever, as I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel. But if ye shall at all turn from following me, ye or your children, and will not keep my commandments and my statutes which I have set before you, but go and serve other gods, and worship them; then will I cut off Israel out of the land which I have given them; and this house, which I have hallowed for my name, will I cast out of my sight; and Israel shall be a proverb and a byword among all people; and at this house, which is high, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss, and they shall say, Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land, and to this house? and they shall answer, Because they forsook the Lord their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt, and have taken hold upon other gods, and have worshipped them, and served them; therefore hath the Lord brought upon them all this evil." This solemn declaration of Jehovah to Solomon is purposely laid before the reader at length, because it contrasts in a remarkable manner with the king's subsequent conduct, when he became infected with idolatry, and apostatised from the God of his fathers. How literally the divine warning was fulfilled is too well known. Israel has been "cut off out of the land" assigned to them by Jehovah, and at the time of Solomon a most luxuriant and fertile land—the magnificent temple fell before an invading foe, and Israel has become a "proverb and a byword among all people." It is true that all this did not result solely from Solomon's conduct, but men have nothing to do with the mysterious purposes of Providence, and they are addressed personally and individually by the Lord of heaven in such a manner as to make every thing, whether good or evil, depend on themselves. They are dealt with as rational and accountable beings, having the good and evil set before them, with power to choose or reject, and they are promised rewards if they follow the one, and threat-

ened with certain and condign punishment if they follow the other. Solomon was warned of what would inevitably be the result if he departed from his duty and allegiance; he was reminded in the midst of his greatness that he was a man, liable to error and failings, and that his prosperity and security would altogether depend on his adherence to the Divine Law.

Solomon at this period of his reign "passed all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom." We are repeatedly told that "the king made silver in Jerusalem as stones, and cedar-trees made he as the sycamore-trees that are in the low plains in abundance." Moreover—"all the drinking vessels of King Solomon were of pure gold, and all the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon were of pure gold; none were of silver; it was not any thing accounted of in the days of Solomon." We are not to suppose, however, that the Hebrews were latterly happy under his government. On the contrary, it is evident from the remonstrance of the Ten Tribes at the accession of his son, and his refusal to lighten their burdens, which caused the revolt, that he governed them in the most oppressive and arbitrary manner, taxing them most severely to defray his expensive undertakings. The Hebrews appear to have been dazzled by the glory of his reign, and by the high position they then occupied as the principal people of Western Asia, but when they calmly reasoned after his death, and recollected the price they had paid to support his magnificence and splendour, their language and their conduct sufficiently indicated their oppressed condition.

It must not, at the same time, be forgotten that Solomon derived a great part of his wealth from his own enterprise and speculations, and by the high celebrity which he had acquired for wisdom. Many foreigners and even sovereign princes were attracted to Jerusalem to see and converse with the prosperous royal sage—"All the kings of the earth sought the presence of Solomon," says

the inspired historian, "to hear his wisdom that God had put in his heart. And they brought every man his present, vessels of silver and vessels of gold, and raiment, harness, and spices, horses, and mules, a fate year by year." This alone would afford him a prodigious revenue, and the sacred writer gives us one example. A sovereign princess, called the Queen of Sheba, had heard of the fame of the magnificent Hebrew king, and "she came to prove Solomon with hard questions at Jerusalem, with a very great company, and camels that bare spices, and gold in abundance, and precious stones."

Respecting the "hard questions" which the Queen of Sheba came to ask Solomon, they were probably riddles, or enigmas, which the Scripture does not condescend to preserve. Some observations are made on this ancient Oriental practice in the history of Samson, whose famous riddle is the only one preserved in Scripture (see SAMSON). The reader will have some idea of the nature of these riddles, or enigmas, by reminding him of the celebrated one which *Cædipus* is classically said to have solved. The question is asked, "What animal is that which goes upon four feet in the morning, upon two at noon, and upon three in the evening?" The answer is—"Man, who in infancy goes upon all-fours, walks erect in manhood, and in old age requires the aid of a staff." This is precisely analogous to the riddle of Samson—"Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness." The answer, which has a reference to one of his own exploits, is—"What is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?" Josephus gives an extract from the archives of Tyre, from which it appears that Solomon and Hiram amused themselves by the interchange of riddles, and he who could not solve them was to pay a forfeit of a certain sum of money. Hiram was unable to solve them, and paid the forfeits, until he discovered one Abde-mon, a "very youth in age," who always conquered the difficult problems

which Solomon, king of Jerusalem, commanded him to explain. The following is the extract from the archives of Tyre, given by Josephus from *Dias*:—"Solomon, who was then king of Jerusalem, sent riddles to Hiram, and desired to receive the like from him, but that he who could not solve them should pay money to him who did solve them. Hiram accepted the conditions, and when he was not able to solve the riddles [proposed by Solomon] he paid a great deal of money for his fine, but he afterwards did solve the proposed riddles, by means of Abde-mon, a man of Tyre; and that Hiram proposed other riddles, which, when Solomon could not solve, he paid back a great deal of money to Hiram."

Whatever degree of credit may be awarded to this story, Solomon was fortunate in his explication of the "hard questions" proposed by the Queen of Sheba. He told her "all her questions, and there was nothing hid from Solomon which he told her not." The princess was astonished at what she both heard and saw at Jerusalem; and the regular progress of business, the arrangements for security from foreign and domestic enemies, the army, the horsemen, the armouries and chariots, the palaces, the royal household, and the good order in the administration of the affairs of the extensive Hebrew kingdom, excited as much admiration as the wisdom and learning of the royal sage. The queen could not repress her admiration. "It was a true report," she said to the viceroy of *Jehovah*, "which I heard in mine own land, of thine acts and of thy wisdom. Howbeit, I believed not their words, until I came, and mine eyes had seen it; and, behold, the one half of the greatness of thy wisdom was not told me, for thou exceedest the fame that I heard. Happy are thy men, and happy are these thy servants, which stand continually before thee, and hear thy wisdom. Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on his throne, to be king for the Lord thy God: because thy God loved Israel, to establish them for ever,

therefore made he thee king over them, to do justice and judgment." She then gave Solomon the magnificent present of "an hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices great abundance, and precious stones; neither was there any such spice as the Queen of Sheba gave King Solomon." She returned highly gratified to her own country.

It is unnecessary to enter here into a geographical inquiry whether we are to identify this country of Sheba with Sabæa in Arabia Felix, or Abyssinia, as stated by Josephus, and strongly urged in modern times by Bruce. This has caused much elaborate discussion, but there cannot be the slightest doubt that the Arabian Sabæa is frequently the Sheba or Seba of the Scriptures, whatever the Sheba, the queen of which visited Solomon, may indicate. We merely draw the reader to the Abyssinian traditions on this subject related by Bruce. It is said that the Queen of Sheba, otherwise Abyssinia, remained at Jerusalem a considerable time, and made herself acquainted with the Jewish religion—a statement which seems to be corroborated by her speech to Solomon, wherein she distinctly recognizes Jehovah as the invisible Head of the theocratic monarchy, and Solomon as His viceroy. The protracted residence of the queen at Jerusalem to comprehend the order of that government she so much admired is farther sanctioned by the independent testimony of the Mahometans, who allege that Baalbec was originally built by Solomon for her residence. The Abyssinians relate that she returned to her kingdom of Abyssinia with a son whom she had by Solomon, who was afterwards sent to be educated at Jerusalem, and who finally returned with a colony of Jews, consisting of priests and other learned persons, by whose aid the people were instructed in the Hebrew religion and laws, and the government modelled after that of Solomon. The son of Solomon by the Queen of Sheba succeeded her on the Abyssinian throne, and the line of sovereigns thus descended from him

have ever gloried in tracing their origin from the royal Hebrew. It is of course too much to believe implicitly all these details, but certainly the traces of that admiration which induced the Queen of Sheba to imitate Solomon's government can be discovered in Abyssinia, while they have all vanished from the Arabian Sabæa. We find the Jewish system pervading the existing ideas, usages, laws, and even religion of the Abyssinians, for though their religion is called Christian, there is more of Judaism in it than Christianity. There is great probability in the leading facts of the Abyssinian narrative, and it is not incompatible with the geographical position.

Solomon's transactions and enterprises now claim our attention, and here it may be presumed that the inspired historian merely gives us a few of the many which distinguished the remarkable reign of this monarch. The erection of the Temple and of several other edifices were great and noble undertakings, exclusive of the building and repairing of several cities, but he made his reign conspicuous by other works which enriched his treasury and extended his fame. We are told that he "brought horses out of Egypt, and linen yarn; the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price, and they fetched up, and brought forth out of Egypt, a chariot for six hundred shekels of silver, and an horse for an hundred and fifty." The price of a chariot, according to this statement, in our money, taking the higher or lower valuation of a shekel from two shillings and sixpence to two shillings and threepence, would be L.75 to L.68, 9s.; and the price of a horse, at 150 shekels, would be from L.18, 15s. to L.17, 2s. The prohibition to "multiply" horses in the Mosaic Law, and the reasons assigned for it, are repeatedly noticed in the present work; it may be briefly observed, therefore, that by this wholesale purchase of horses and chariots Solomon established a very profitable monopoly, which the situation of his dominions rendered it easy to maintain. As his southern frontier extended from the

Mediterranean to the Euphrates, and touched intermediately at the Red Sea, it was impossible for the Syrians and Phœnicians to receive horses from Egypt without passing through his territories, and the method of taking them by sea was not only unknown, but it would have been both troublesome and expensive. Consequently the Syrians and Phœnicians, rather than be without horses, would take them at any price from his factors or "merchants." The word translated *linen yarn* is given as a proper name in the Septuagint, and, without agreeing to that rendering, the authority of the Seventy Translators is sufficient to show us that linen yarn is not the right rendering. Mr Taylor, the editor of Calmet, conjectures that *strings* or *cords* are intended. If an opinion might be hazarded in the present work, we would suggest that *harness* is intimated.

One of Solomon's great undertakings was to establish a navy, the rendezvous of which he made at Ezion-Geber near Eloth, or Elath, close to the head of the Elanitic Gulf of the Red Sea, on the other side of the Peninsula of Sinai. Those vessels were manned by the Phœnician subjects of Hiram, engaged by Solomon for that purpose, to aid and instruct his own subjects in the science of navigation—a science hitherto unknown by the Hebrews, who were a pastoral people. The broad Mediterranean extended before their coasts, called by them the Great Sea, but the countries beyond it were to them unknown, if indeed they ever at that time conceived there were any regions beyond its expansive surface. The Phœnicians, moreover, dwelling on their coasts, and the Tyrians and Sidonians, had by their mercantile enterprises monopolized the whole of the maritime trade. It was reserved to Solomon, and afterwards attempted to be revived by his enterprising descendant, King Jehoshaphat, to perceive the advantages of a maritime traffic, and accordingly the "king's ships went to Tarshish with the servants of Hiram; every three years once came the ships of Tarshish, bringing

gold, and silver, ivory, and asses, and peacocks." In other passages Tarshish is named in conjunction with Ophir, and the identifying of the countries to which the Hebrew fleet directed its course for the commodities mentioned has occasioned no little controversy, into which it would be out of place here to enter. It may be simply mentioned that the southwestern coast of Arabia, the eastern coast of Africa, the Persian Gulf, and the coast and isles of India, have had each its respective supporters, while Tarshish has also been identified with Spain.

We are next informed that Solomon built "Tadmor in the Wilderness." This is universally admitted to be Palmyra, an ancient magnificent city in the Syrian Desert. Both names are synonymous, and refer to the palm-trees which grew there, though these have long disappeared. The ruins of this celebrated city are understood to occupy the site of Solomon's Tadmor. The probable reason which can be assigned for the Hebrew king building a city in the midst of an inhospitable desert was, that through the said desert passed those caravans which conveyed by land the produce of Eastern Asia from the Persian Gulf and Babylon to Phœnicia, Syria, and Asia Minor; and the site of Tadmor, which enjoys the inestimable advantage of good water in the inhospitable waste, would make it at a very remote period the resting place of the eastern caravans in their route westward through the desert. As Solomon engrossed the maritime commerce which existed between the east and west by the Red Sea, as his dominions extended to the Euphrates, and as the caravans must of necessity have passed through his territories, he would not neglect the opportunity of obtaining benefit from the land trade between Eastern and Western Asia. Palmyra, or Tadmor in the Wilderness, owed its origin and its subsequent splendour to its trade, but what precise part Solomon took in that trade it is impossible to say. He probably contented himself with levying dues and customs, or he might

have built it for the convenience of the Hebrew merchants, who in that case would buy up the goods and sell them at a profit to the Phœnicians and others; but, when we recollect the analogy of the horse trade with Egypt, it is not improbable that Solomon's factors or "merchants" bought up the commodities of the East for the king himself, and he resold them for his own emolument. The founding of Tadmor may also have been the suggestion of the Phœnicians, as Solomon was on the most friendly terms with that enterprising people, who greatly assisted him in his maritime undertakings.

Baalath is another city ascribed to Solomon. The name signifies the *city of Baal*, or of *the sun*, for *Baal* was *the sun*, and is supposed to indicate Baalbec, which means *the valley of Baal*, or of *the sun*, which was known to the ancients by the classical name of *Helio-polis*, also the *city of the sun*. It is situated in the great valley of Cœlo-Syria, about thirty-six miles north-west from Damascus, and nearly the same distance from the Mediterranean. We have already noticed the Moslem tradition that Baalbec was built for the residence and in honour of the Queen of Sheba, which is of course a mere fancy, and the natives may or may not be believed when they maintain that it was founded by Solomon as a pleasant retreat during the summer heats. Wood observes that "an Eastern monarch could not enjoy his favourite pleasures in a more luxurious retirement than amidst the streams and shades of Baalbec." Benjamin of Tudela fully believes that Baalbec is the Baalath built by Solomon, and narrates as facts the local traditions on the subject.

Certain cisterns near Tyre are ascribed to Solomon, "supposed," says Maundrell, "according to the common tradition hereabouts, to have been made by that great king as a part of his recompence to king Hiram for the supplies of materials sent by him towards building the Temple. They are doubtless very ancient, but yet of a much later date than

what this tradition ascribes to them. That they could not be built till since Alexander the Great's time may be conjectured from this among other arguments—because the aqueduct which conveys the water hence to Tyre is carried over the neck of land by which Alexander in his famous siege of this place joined the city to the continent. And as the cisterns cannot well be imagined to be more ancient than the aqueduct, so one may be sure the aqueduct cannot be older than the ground it stands upon. Of these cisterns there are three entire at this day, one about a furlong and a half distant from the sea, the other two a little farther up." To this it may be added, that it is no uncommon thing for the Orientals to ascribe all great works to Solomon. His name is as well known in Persia as in Western Asia, and he is held in the greatest veneration by all the Mahometans, whose traditions of him are innumerable.

The other undertakings of Solomon are noticed in the Book of Ecclesiastes by the king himself. "I made me great works: I builded me houses: I planted me vineyards: I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruits: I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees: I got me servants [slaves] and maidens, and had servants born in my house: also I had great possessions of great and small cattle above all in Jerusalem that were before me: I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of kings and of the provinces: I gat me singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts. So I was great, and increased more than all that were before me in Jerusalem; also my wisdom remained with me." The son of Sirach thus sets forth the praise of the royal sage in the Apocryphal Book of Ecclesiasticus—"Solomon reigned in a peaceable time, and was honoured; for God made all quiet about him, that he might build an house [the Temple] in his name, and prepare

his sanctuary for ever. How wise wast thou in thy youth, and, as a flood, filled with understanding ! Thy soul covered the whole earth, and thou filled it with dark parables. Thy name went far unto the islands, and for thy peace thou wast beloved. The countries marvelled at thee for thy songs, and proverbs, and parables, and interpretations. By the name of the Lord God which is called the God of Israel, thou didst gather gold as tin, and didst multiply silver as lead."

Hitherto we have seen Solomon great, magnificent, and enterprising, the builder of the gorgeous Temple, embellishing Jerusalem with various splendid edifices and useful public works, founding cities, and engaging in most extensive mercantile and maritime projects, which were all crowned with success—we have seen him thus "in his glory," the most renowned monarch of his time, the highly favoured and honoured viceroy of Jehovah, attracting sovereign princes from all quarters to hear his wisdom, and listen to his sage maxims. Now we must speak of him as the reverse—as allowing his noble faculties to be enervated by effeminacy, luxuriousness, and debauchery. How solemn is the statement of the inspired historian ! "But Solomon loved many strange women, together [or *besides*] the daughter of Pharaoh." He committed no fault in marrying the Egyptian princess, for she was a proselyte to the Jewish religion according to the common opinion. The Jews were permitted to marry women of several nations if they conformed to the Mosaic ritual, though they were expressly forbidden to intermarry with any of the seven Canaanitish nations, even if they embraced their religion, lest the venom of idolatry might lurk among them, and at last break out and infect them. But in establishing a numerous harem—in marrying so many women besides Pharaoh's daughter, Solomon committed a twofold sin against the Mosaic Law—the kings of Israel, before the monarchy existed except in anticipation, having been expressly prohibited from "multiplying" wives ; and the

other, the intermarrying women of strange nations, who still retained their idolatrous religion. Well might the son of Sirach say of him, "Thou didst bow thy loins unto women, and by thy body thou wast brought into subjection. Thou didst stain thy honour, and pollute thy seed, so that thou broughtest wrath upon thy children."—"O Solomon," exclaims the pious Bishop Hall, "where was thy wisdom, when thine affections ran away with thee into such wild voluptuousness ? What availeth it thee to discourse of all things, when thou knowest not thyself ?"

Solomon married "women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites," the very nations of whom Jehovah had expressly declared—"ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in to you ; for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods." The harem of the now effeminate king of Israel consisted of "seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines." These seven hundred wives, "princesses," were the daughters of great men, and the three hundred concubines were women of inferior rank. Solomon, who had long worshipped the true God and revered the Mosaic Law, who is one of the clearest and most impressive teachers of religious truth who ever enlightened mankind, in the decline of life and inflamed by the long enjoyment of uninterrupted prosperity and royal power, was induced to forego the vigilance of his piety, and to exhibit the usual adjuncts of the splendid and powerful Oriental monarchs. It is well known that among them an extensive female establishment is regarded as an essential part of royal state, of which we have ample illustrations in the customs of India, China, Persia, and Turkey. The ladies of the Great Mogul's harem in the seventeenth century are stated to have been in number one thousand—exactly the number of Solomon's, and in Persia this number has not only been equalled but even greatly exceeded. It is related of Darius Codomannus that he was accustomed in time of war to carry

with him three hundred and fifty females, and that their presence was not disagreeable to the queen, who also attended in the camp, for they all held her in the utmost veneration as if she had been a goddess. Sir John Malcolm, speaking of the great Persian monarch Khoosroo, gives, on the authority of the Persian writers, in which he allows there is much exaggeration, the following account of Khoosroo's court:—"His noble palaces, of which he built one for every season—his *thrones*, which were invaluable—his *treasures*—his *ladies*, of whom there were *twelve thousand*, each, if we believe the gravest of Persian writers, equal to the moon in beauty—his *horses*, of which fifty thousand stood in the royal stables—his twelve hundred elephants,—are subjects on which a thousand volumes have been written by his countrymen."

The effects of this "multiplying of wives" soon became apparent in Solomon's conduct. He who was "wiser than all men" sunk into the indolent habits of the harem, and "his wives turned away his heart." By gaining an ascendancy over him they lessened his zeal against idolatry, and induced him to tolerate their abominable rites. They might also obtain money from him for the support of their priests, and to defray the expenses of their sacrifices. We are told that when Solomon was old—it is thought about the fifty-fourth year of his age, and the thirty-fourth of his reign—"his wives turned away his heart after other gods, and his heart was not perfect with the Lord God of David his father. For Solomon went after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcour, the abomination of the Ammonites." The meaning of these statements is, that Solomon did not altogether renounce the worship of the true God, or believe that these idols were endued with divine power, but that he united with his own worship that of false deities. This clearly proves how completely his mind had become enervated by the indulgence of sensual pleasures, more especially when we recollect his declara-

tions in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple. He built "an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab," on the Mount of Olives, immediately opposite Jerusalem, and thus defiled that mount afterwards hallowed by the presence of the Son of God: and on this sacred locality was also set up the idol Molech, the "abomination of [or belonging to] the children of Ammon." Such was the unhappy conduct of Solomon—of a prince who at his accession to the throne confessed his inexperience to govern, and entreated God to give him "a wise and understanding heart."—"That he," says Jahn, "should tolerate idolatry in the foreign countries the Hebrews had conquered was not a violation of the Law, which was enjoined on the Hebrews only, but that he should allow the idolatry of his wives in his own dominions, and even in his capital—that he should build temples to the gods, if he did not himself offer them sacrifices—this was a breach of the fundamental law—it was encouraging them to rebel against Jehovah their King."

Solomon was soon informed of the punishment with which Jehovah intended to visit him for this apostacy—"I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant [Jeroboam]. Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it for David thy father's sake, but I will rend it out of the hand of thy son. Howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom, but will give one tribe [Judah and Benjamin considered as one tribe] to thy son for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake." In what spirit Solomon received this solemn warning it is not stated. His prosperity was also interrupted by disturbances in Syria under Reson, and in Idumea or Edom under Hadad, but he was greatly alarmed by a dangerous conspiracy formed against him, at the head of which was Jeroboam. When this conspiracy was discovered, Jeroboam fled to Egypt; the common resort of all the disaffected Hebrews, and remained there until the death of Solomon.

The inspired historian records no more of the life of Solomon, and Josephus does not attempt to give us any farther information. We are merely in the form of interrogation—"And the rest of the acts of Solomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the book of the acts of Solomon?" Whatever was the nature of that book it is now lost. The Jews believe that his inimitable inspired production called the Book of Ecclesiastes was written by him after repenting of the life of idolatry and sin into which he had been seduced; and if this be the case, which is more than probable, it affords valuable proofs of the sincerity with which he regretted his departure from virtue and the true religion. Josephus tells us that "Solomon died when he was already an old man, having reigned eighty years, and lived ninety-four." The Scriptures, on the other hand, inform us that "all the time that Solomon reigned in Jerusalem over all Israel was forty years;" and if he was eighteen or twenty years of age at his accession, which is generally admitted, he must have died in about the fifty-eighth or sixtieth year of his age. He died little lamented, notwithstanding the splendour of his reign, and he was buried in the sepulchre of David on Mount Zion, in the year B.C. 975, according to the Hebrew chronology.

The following character of Solomon by Dr Jortin forms an appropriate conclusion to this article:—"Solomon in wisdom and knowledge surpassed all his contemporaries. He was a poet, a natural and experimental philosopher, and a political and moral philosopher. Unhappily he did not practise himself all the excellent rules which he delivered to others. He violated the laws of Moses, especially in taking pagan and idolatrous wives and concubines, the number of whom also was highly immoral and scandalous, and when he grew old these women seduced him so far as to set up the worship of their false gods in his dominions. For these transgressions God punished him, and raised him up enemies to disquiet

him at the latter end of his reign; and when he died, he left behind him a discontented people, and a foolish son and successor, who soon lost more than half of the kingdom. One would think it impossible that Solomon could ever have committed such errors and such crimes. He had received his crown directly from the hand of God, who had preferred him to it though a younger son; he had been favoured with divine revelations; he had been appointed to build a magnificent temple for the service of God; he had received promises of wisdom, knowledge, wealth, glory, peace, power, prosperity, and every temporal blessing, and these promises had been signally accomplished. How could such a prince shut his eyes against such evidence! How could he be guilty of such monstrous forgetfulness and ingratitude! It is too often seen, as in his instance, that the follies of men of uncommon parts and penetration are greater than those of men of mean abilities and low capacities; and Solomon stands a memorable example of great accomplishments and great frailties, and of the dangerous effects of too much power and prosperity."

SOSIPATER, a companion of St Paul, who sends his salutation to the Christians at Rome.

SOSTHENES, a Jewish convert to Christianity who was severely beaten by the Greek Jews of Corinth. He had been the chief ruler of the synagogue in that city. St Paul calls him "our brother," and associates his name with his own at the commencement of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

STACHYS, called by St Paul "my beloved," a Roman Christian to whom the Apostle sends his salutations.

STEPHANAS, a person whose "household" is mentioned by St Paul as the first converts in Achaia, all of whom had been baptized by the Apostle. He says to the Corinthians—"Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." It appears (1 Cor. xvi. 17) that Stephanas

himself was included among the number. He came to St Paul at Ephesus. No other particulars are related of him.

STEPHEN was one of the seven Deacons chosen to attend to the wants of the poor widows, at the complaint of the Hellenistic or foreign Jews, that they were overlooked in the daily distribution. The names of all the seven are Greek, and a question has hence been raised whether they were Gentile proselytes or foreign Jews who spoke the Greek language. One of them, Nicolaus of Antioch, certainly was the latter, but as he alone is so denominated, we may conclude that the rest were Jews by birth. Stephen certainly was, for in his defence he claims descent from Abraham. Another question was raised by the ancients, whether these new officers were elected from the seventy Evangelists, or from the general body of believers. From their consecration to their new duty by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles, it has been concluded that they were not of the number of the Evangelists who were endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit at the day of Pentecost. It is not a subject of great importance, though they were chosen as men full of the Holy Ghost, and it is certainly impossible to settle it satisfactorily. It is evident, however, that their whole duty was not confined to the supply of the temporal wants of the poor—they also preached the Gospel publicly, and wrought miracles; but this seems to have been no part of that particular office to which they were elected by the disciples, and ordained by the apostles.

Stephen was the first of these assistants of the apostles, who have since been called deacons, and he devoted himself to the work of proclaiming the truth publicly with great zeal and success. He wrought many miracles before the people. This zeal exposed him to the bitter hatred of the unbelieving foreign Jews. The sects or synagogues of these envious opponents who are mentioned are from Asia, Europe, and Africa, and we conclude that he was more peculiarly ob-

noxious to them. They first attempted to refute or silence him in argument, but found themselves more than over-matched by one for whom they seem to have entertained no little contempt—they could not withstand the wisdom and eloquent reasons which he advanced in support of the doctrines which he taught. Had they been sincere in their zeal and honest in their intentions, this would have led them to doubt the goodness of their own cause, and examine with candour the arguments of Stephen. But such a reasonable proceeding was most distant from their minds—they procured false witnesses, who declared that they had heard Stephen utter blasphemies against Moses and against God. By such means they raised a tumult among the fanatical Jews, who rushed upon Stephen, and dragged him before the Sanhedrim, who were ever ready and eager to listen to any accusation, however false, against the followers of Christ. Here the suborned witnesses repeated the accusations which they had disseminated among the people—that they had heard Stephen declare that "Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the temple and city of Jerusalem, and would change the customs which Moses had delivered them." That the temple and city of Jerusalem would be destroyed, as Jesus and all the prophets had foretold, on account of the infidelity and wickedness of the Jews, Stephen no doubt did warn them; and it is as true that he did teach that Jesus of Nazareth was a greater prophet than Moses, and had already accomplished all the changes which Moses had foretold he would introduce, for the purpose of perfecting the shadowy and typical dispensation which he was commissioned to institute; but for that very reason were they bound to listen to the proofs of such doctrines which Stephen produced from their own acknowledged scriptures, like men who were appointed to study and explain the oracles of God, and to watch the signs of the times, which were pregnant with such weighty evidence of the truth of Stephen's earnest warning. They did in-

deed listen, but it was not with the impartiality of judges who wished to be convinced of the innocence of the accused, or to examine into the truth of his doctrine. Their plots for the destruction of Peter and John and the rest of the apostles had failed of success by the mightier interference of God, and their own fear of a popular commotion, but now the fanaticism of the multitude, or of a violent portion of it, was on their side, and Stephen, they hoped, would be a more easy victim than the apostles. Stephen, supported by the strength of a good conscience, and by the confidence that the cause in which he stood there was the cause of God, of truth, and of the people of God's choice, remained undaunted and serene before that conclave of the learned but bigoted judges of his country, and the unscrupulous malice of those false witnesses.

When the high priest asked him if the charge and accusation were true he called no witnesses, he sought no subterfuge, but repeated and justified all that he had taught. In a clear and convincing historical deduction of the dealings of God with the children of Abraham, from the time when He called and separated him as the father of a peculiar people of witnesses to His truth, he showed how God had constantly been present with that people, to deliver them from danger, to chastise them for sin, to carry onward the increasing development of his plan of moral government for the redemption and sanctification of his people. He showed how ungrateful and rebellious and unbelieving they had been throughout the whole of their history—how from Moses downwards through all the changes of that preparatory dispensation they had refused to obey the laws of God and listen with faith to his prophets, rejecting and persecuting and murdering them. They of the present generation had proved themselves no better but worse than their fathers, betraying and murdering that Holy and Just One of whose coming all the prophets foretold, and for whom they prepared the way. Having

thus filled up the measure of their fathers' rebellion and unbelief, they might judge themselves what the Law and the Prophets warned them to expect. This was in a style of plain-spoken severity, in which those proud and sanctimonious judges were not accustomed to be addressed, but it was in the very language of reproof and warning which God had all along used toward their fathers by the prophets of old. While the inspired Evangelist rebuked them with this just censure, their guilty consciences acknowledged the charge—they were cut to the heart, but it was not with contrition and a remorseful sense of guilt—it was with rage at the fearless boldness of a poor individual, who durst presume to lift the veil from their hypocrisy, and show their conduct in its true colours. A fierce outcry of vengeance burst from that polluted bench of sacerdotal judges—they gnashed upon Stephen with their teeth, as if in their wolfish fury they would have torn him to pieces. He, unmoved with this storm of undignified rage, and unmindful of the consequences to which it was leading, looked stedfastly up to a higher and impartial Judge—the heavens were opened, and he, as if appealing from the unjust sentence of that doomed court, blinded in mind and hardened in heart, exclaimed, "Behold the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Such an appeal was considered by them as the most impious blasphemy—as the crowning evidence of his unpardonable guilt. They sought no farther evidence—they waited not to deliberate on any formal sentence—their frantic conduct justified all that Stephen had said against them—they cried out with fury—they stopped their ears, and in a tumult ran upon him, cast him out of the Temple as profane and polluted, dragged him out of the city, and without waiting for the sanction of the Roman procurator, who alone seems to have held the power of the sword, stoned him to death. We have every reason to suppose that the glorious vision of his Lord sitting on the throne of righteous judgment was pre-

sent to his eyes while this execution of unrighteous judgment drove him from the cruelty of men. He was the first that had followed Jesus to glory in the path of blood, and while he calmly resigned his soul into the hands of his gracious Lord, who had thus manifested himself from the invisible depths of heaven to support His first martyr, like Jesus that martyr could pray; in that hour of torturing pain, and of the triumph of ungodly men, that their sin should not be laid to their charge. Thus did this zealous witness of the truth seal his testimony to the doctrine which he preached, and "fell asleep," as Luke expresses it, *crowned* with victory in a cause of holier patriotism than any for which the valiant warriors of civil liberty ever bled. The young Saul was there consenting, perhaps taking savage delight at witnessing such an unjust perpetration of cruelty. But the martyr's prayers were heard, and speedily answered in the conversion of one who was afterwards to bear the banner of truth through as fierce contest, and with nobler success.

The fabulous legends of the Romish Church contain much longer histories of

the miracles said to have been wrought by his bones and ashes than he is ever reported to have wrought during his life. We will not task the reader's credulity by mentioning any of these in the course of the various travels which the martyr's relics were made by the superstition of a degenerate age to undergo, till they rested in the great storehouse of fictitious miracles at Rome. Many of these, like that of the regular melting and bubbling up of a bottle of his blood, at Naples, on the anniversary of his death, are childless and ludicrous. We know not, with any certainty, how long the power of working miracles was vouchsafed to the Church, but, assuredly, however long that proof of the divinity of the doctrines was thought necessary, we have every ground from Scripture and reason to conclude that it would rather be conferred on living men, who preached the truth, than on mouldering bones, which, in the great majority of cases, can be easily proved to be anything rather than the remains of those saints which their juggling custodiers and credulous worshippers look upon with such grovelling and superstitious veneration.

T

TAMAR. See **ABSALOM** and **DAVID**.

TERAH. See **ABRAHAM**.

TERTIUS, a companion of St Paul, who intimates to the Romans—"I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord." The meaning is that he wrote the Epistle at the dictation of St Paul. Nothing is known of his history.

TERTULLUS, a "certain orator," as he is called by the Evangelical historian, who appeared as the prosecutor of the Apostle in behalf of the Jews at Cæsarea, before Felix the Roman procurator of Judea. It is probable, from his name, that he was a Roman lawyer whom the Jews employed on this occasion, on account of his being conversant

with the Roman language and forms of justice. In his speech he accuses St Paul as a "mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes." This is the only passage in the Apostolical writings intimating that Christians had been designated by this name, although it was often applied to Christ himself.

THEOPHILUS, a Christian convert of distinction to whom St Luke addresses his Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles, but of whom nothing is known.

THEUDAS, an imposter noticed in the admirable speech of Gamaliel, who in the third year before the account

called *Anno Domini*, appeared in Judea, "boasting himself to be somebody, to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain, and all, as many as obeyed (or *believed*) him, were scattered, and brought to nought." It has been sometimes objected to the accuracy of St Luke, who gives the speech of Gamaliel, that an imposter called Thaddeus is mentioned by Josephus as having appeared in Judea in the fourth year of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, many years after the speech made by Gamaliel. It is probable, however, that there were two imposters of this name, which was in those times common among the Jews, and Josephus himself informs us that many insurrections took place, several of which he does not narrate. The circumstances mentioned by the Evangelical writer and the Jewish historian are also different.

THOMAS, the Apostle, called also Didymus, or the Twin, which is only the interpretation in Greek of his original name. Nothing is known of his parentage, of the place of his birth, of his education, nor of his employment before he became a follower of Jesus. From his retiring to Galilee with the rest of the apostles after the resurrection, and his going with Peter and the others to fish, it has been reasonably supposed that he was a fisher, and a native of Galilee. We have no very particular mention made of him in the Evangelical history of our Lord's personal ministry. When the sisters of Lazarus sent to inform Christ of their brother's death, he seems to have been one of those who dissuaded Jesus from exposing himself again to the murderous malice of the Jews, which they had so lately experienced. But when Jesus intimated his intention of going, he exhorted the rest to accompany him even should it be with the certainty of death—"Let us also go, that we may die with him!" In this he indicated a strength of affectionate attachment, though no very great faith in the wisdom and power of his Master. At the last supper he was one of those who expressed some doubt

of Christ's meaning, as if he had been speaking to them in a way which was not intelligible. He had told his followers that they knew whither he went, and also knew the way. Thomas, forgetting the frequent predictions which Christ had uttered in regard to his death and resurrection, replied that they knew not whither he was going, and could not know the way. Christ, instead of answering a question which was the dictate of an unavailing curiosity, said that he "was the way, and the truth, and the life." These were the symptoms of a mind which would not be easily satisfied without the amplest and most irrefragable evidence. In accordance with this we find that Thomas found the greatest difficulty in being convinced of the resurrection of Jesus. All the rest had either obtained positive evidence of this event, or believing our Lord's prediction that he would rise on the third day, had given credit to the report of those who had seen and conversed with him. But Thomas' scruples, and doubts, and fears, were not so easily satisfied. He was absent when Christ appeared in the house to the rest, and when they reported the event to him, he evidently thought that it was some unsubstantial apparition which they had taken for Jesus, and declared that he would not believe till he should see the print of the nails in his Master's hands, and put his fingers into these, and thrust his hand into the wound in his side. In this state of incredulity he remained for a week, and had not our Saviour, in compassion of the weakness of his faith, condescended to satisfy those unreasonable scruples, he might have perished in his obstinate infidelity, which at the time, it is reasonable to suppose, he considered as a proof of the superior strength of his reason, and his freedom from prejudice. Jesus again appeared to the Eleven when Thomas was present, and requested him to satisfy his scruples by the test of the senses, by which alone he declared he would be convinced. The doubting Apostle was now satisfied that Jesus, who had thus triumphed over death and

the grave, was indeed his Lord and his God, and his temporary unbelief has added strength to the many convincing proofs which we possess of the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and the fulfilment of all the prophecies.

We have no farther notice of this Apostle in the sacred writings, but we learn from Origen, Jerome, and other ancient writers, that he travelled first into Parthia, and afterwards to the most distant India, preaching the Gospel with great patience and corresponding success in Media, Persia, and the neighbouring nations. One author says that the Magi, who were guided by the star from Persia to pay homage to the Messiah in his infancy, were still living in that country—that they listened eagerly to his preaching, were converted, and baptized, and afterwards assisted St Thomas in his labours. The Hindoo Brahmins have ever been known for their inveterate attachment to their superstition, and it is said that it was with the utmost patience in continued argument that they were, many of them, at last convinced of the folly of their idolatry, and embraced the doctrines of the Gospel. He travelled as far as Malabar, visited the large island of Sumatra, and established Christianity in these countries. From modern researches in the east it appears not improbable that he found multitudes of Jews of the first captivity, and that many of them were persuaded to believe in Jesus as their promised Messiah. The Portuguese made settlements in India in the sixteenth century, and found many Christian churches still remaining, whose unvarying report was that Christianity was first introduced into that country by St Thomas. Dr C. Buchanan, in his *Christian Researches*, found also very interesting traces of the Apostle's labours, and churches still retaining the name and memory of St Thomas their founder. It must not be concealed, however, that these traditionary reports represent the first success of the Gospel to have been again counteracted by a return to infidelity, and that there was in much later

days a Syrian missionary whom they call Mar Thomé, and who, with the assistance of several priests from his own country and from Egypt, again converted many of the Indians to the belief of the truth. Calmet thinks that it is from this individual that these Christians took the name of St Thomas. It is not unlikely, however, from the traces of great antiquity found among the Carnatic mountains and valleys by Dr Buchanan, that some of the first seeds of the truth sown by apostolic labours were propagated without interruption for 1700 years.

However this be, it is agreed that St Thomas laboured long and successfully in those distant regions of the east—perhaps even to the confines of China. After visiting the numerous and extensive islands in that part of the Indian Ocean, he returned to the banks of the Ganges, where he obtained the countenance of the prince of the country, and a grant of land upon which he built a church. He wrought many miracles, and at last the Nabob, with many of his friends and subjects, embraced his doctrines. This excited the bigoted and selfish resentment of the Brahmins, who, like the idolaters of other countries, foresaw the downfall of their influence if Thomas should continue to withdraw their object votaries. The Apostle was accustomed, like Jesus, to retire to a solitary place for the purpose of devotion, and here they set upon him when alone, and shot him to death with arrows, as it is reported. His body was buried by his disciples in the church which he had lately erected. The Roman Catholics, as usual, say that that church was a storehouse of miracles, which we will not report. The Portuguese governor of Bengal is said to have dug up the Apostle's remains in the sixteenth century, and to have found ancient inscriptions, giving an account of his coming into that country, and of his success in converting the natives, and of the manner of his death. It must be confessed, however, that implicit faith is not to be given to half of what is recorded concerning St Thomas by such authorities.

TIGLATH-PILESER, an ancient king of Assyria, who subdued Syria, Galilee, and all the territory east of the Jordan, B.C. 740. He sent the principal inhabitants of Syria to the banks of the river Kir, otherwise Cyrus, which unites its waters with the Araxes, and empties itself into the Caspian Sea. It is still called Kur by the Russians, and Kier by the Persians. The inhabitants of Galilee were transferred to Assyria.

TIMOTHY, the Evangelist, was a native of Lystra or Derbe in Asia Minor. His father was a Gentile proselyte, but both his mother and grandmother, Eunice and Lois, were Jewesses. They were women of great piety and knowledge of the Scriptures, and by them Timothy was from his childhood made acquainted with the revealed truths of heaven. In Paul's first visit to these cities, Lois and Eunice, if not also Timothy, became converts to the doctrines preached by the Apostle, for which their minds were prepared by their knowledge of the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament. He seems to have been naturally of a very amiable and affectionate disposition, receiving the communication of the truth, as we are informed by Paul, with a flood of tears. His many virtues, and his youthful zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, gained him the universal esteem and love of the Christians of his native city and the neighbourhood. When Paul visited those churches a second time after the apostolic council at Jerusalem, Timothy was pointed out not only by the brethren of Lystra and Iconium, but also, as we learn from the first letter of the Apostle to him, by immediate revelation of the Spirit, as a fit person to be an Evangelist, and an assistant to him. He had not undergone the initiatory rite of the Jewish religion, and Paul, that he might not give any cause of unnecessary offence to his over zealous countrymen, made him so far comply with the Law of Moses in a matter which was to him now indifferent.

After this, he almost constantly attended the Apostle in all his labours,

being only absent from him when sent upon messages of consolation or encouragement to the various churches which he had planted. When Paul took him as an associate in the ministry he was labouring in Asia, but soon after was directed by the Spirit to pass over to Europe, and thither, along with Luke and Silas, Timothy accompanied him. Probably he was not then much above twenty, and it is likely, that while, with the great and eloquent Apostle of the Gentiles, he would be for a time at least more diligent in hearing and learning the deep mysteries of religion, than in being forward himself to preach them. He was left, however, along with Silas, at Berea, when Paul was compelled by the factious proceedings of the infidel Jews to flee to Athens. From that city, again, where he gave a report of the afflicted state of the Thessalonian church, he was sent thither alone to comfort them, and supply the absence of their spiritual father. He joined the Apostle soon after at Corinth with a cheering account of the steadfastness of the Christians of Macedonia, notwithstanding all their persecutions. This induced the Apostle to write his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, in which he joins the names of his two fellow-labourers in honour of them, and approval of the doctrines which they taught. He does the same in the Second, which was written speedily after. We need not follow the account of their united labours for the next three or four years, which is given under the name of Paul. While at Ephesus, Timothy was sent with the Corinthian deputies, and the epistle to that church, where unseemly dissensions and gross abuses had arisen to corrupt the truth, and disturb the unity of the faith. Apollos had been labouring with zeal and eloquence in that refined but corrupt city, and seems to have been driven from it by these dissensions, or by the persecutions of the bigoted Jews, and declined to accept of Paul's commission to heal the disease. It indicates the high estimation in which the young Evangelist was held by Paul

that he chose him for this difficult and dangerous duty, and must give us a very great idea of his ability and Christian experience, when we learn, as we do in the Second Epistle, that he was completely successful. Paul himself was more than ordinarily anxious about the success of this commission, and the faithful discharge of that delicate duty by his younger brother afforded him the highest delight, and must have endeared him more to his ardent and affectionate heart.

We have no farther particular account of Timothy in the Acts of the Apostles. It is possible that he might be left at Ephesus when Paul took leave of the elders of that church on his way to Jerusalem, but we rather think that he accompanied him thither. We know that he was with the Apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome, for his name is joined with that of Paul in the several Epistles written during that confinement. We learn from the conclusion of the Epistle to the Hebrews that Timothy also was imprisoned at Rome, and set at liberty probably at the same time with Paul, and that he accompanied him on his last visit to the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem. We may conclude that he was left at Ephesus when Paul took his fourth and last journey to visit the churches which he had planted in Asia. There are several writers, however, who think that Timothy was left in that city on some previous occasion, and certainly in the First Epistle addressed to him there, St Paul expresses his design of visiting him again (iv. 13), which it is not supposed he did after the visit above mentioned. But again, it is evident that the ardent zeal of St Paul frequently made him resolve, and even promise to visit places, which succeeding circumstances of persecution or of more pressing duty prevented him from doing. The Second Epistle was evidently written from Rome shortly before the martyrdom of the Apostle. In the conclusion he requests Timothy to come to him before winter, which he would no doubt endeavour to do, though we have no certain record of the event. These two

Epistles show the deep interest which Paul felt in his "son and fellow-labourer," and must ever be considered as a most valuable bequest by all those who are placed in a situation similar to that of the Evangelist. We learn from these letters that Timothy did not enjoy good health, and that he was abstemious to such a degree that the Apostle thought it his duty to advise him against excess in this respect, and to take a little more of the comforts of life for the sake of his health. After the death of his beloved teacher, it is generally believed that Timothy resided chiefly at Ephesus, taking charge of the numerous body of Christians there, and opposing the false teachers who had already begun to pervert the truth, and disseminate their deadly errors before the Apostle's death. Paul suffered about the year 67, and Timothy is supposed to have lived nearly thirty years longer, having fallen a victim to the fury of the idolaters of Ephesus in the reign of Nerva, about the year 97. St John is supposed to have laboured in Ephesus before that time. Calmet thinks that Timothy was the angel of that church to whom the Epistle in the Revelations is addressed. If this really be the case, we must be led to conclude that the "falling from the first love," and the exhortation to repentance, are addressed not to him personally, but to the general body of the elders or the members of the church. He is reported to have suffered martyrdom in one of the idolatrous processions in honour of Diana. Moved with zeal against such senseless superstition, he openly reproved the multitudes who crowded in the train of the adored idol. The rabble, armed as they were with clubs, which was a part of the ceremony, fell upon him, and beat him to death. If the date of his death is correct, he must have been about seventy years of age.

TITUS, a convert of St Paul, and a distinguished Evangelist. Though he was early brought to a knowledge of the Christian truth, and attended Paul commonly in his journeys, he is not once mentioned in the Acts, and the little that

is known of him is gleaned from the allusions made to him in the various epistles of that Apostle. It is certain that he was a Gentile, but whether a native of Antioch or Crete, of Corinth or Italy, is not recorded. We are inclined to the opinion of those who suppose that he was converted in Antioch, and was probably a resident in that city. From his name he appears to have been a Roman by birth. No credit is due to the fable that he was a descendant of the ancient royal race of Minos, king and lawgiver of Crete. That he was converted some time before the great council at Jerusalem (A.D. 50), on the subject of the obligation of the Law of Moses on the Gentile believers, is evident, for we learn from the Epistle to the Galatians that he accompanied Paul and Barnabas thither, as a representative of the Gentiles. Notwithstanding that the Apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, unanimously decreed that the Gentiles should be exempted from that burden, a body of Judaizing Christians in Jerusalem strongly insisted that Titus should be circumcised. Upon the principles which they held, however, this would have been no longer a matter of indifference, as it was afterwards in the case of Timothy, but a virtual relinquishing of the whole privilege of Christian liberty, for which the Apostle and the Gentile converts had been contending--a practical acknowledgment that the observance of the rites of the Mosaic Law was a necessary condition of salvation. MacKnight thinks, from the circumstance of the Jewish believers insisting upon this so obviously in the face of the decree just passed, that Titus, previously to his conversion, had been an idolatrous Gentile, concluding that the law now made was in its first intention applicable only to those Gentile Christians who had been already proselytes to Judaism.

Be this as it may, we have every reason to conclude that Titus would not stop at Jerusalem after the departure of Paul. It is not expressly said, but we may suppose that he returned to Antioch, where his high character for zeal and

piety was well known. His name and the controversy connected with it are particularly mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, which was probably written about that time from Antioch, and which it is not unlikely Titus carried to the Church in that country. We are not told whether he attended St Paul in his first visit to Macedonia and Greece, but it has been thought that he again joined the Apostle while he laboured for a year and a half at Corinth and in Achaia. We do not meet with any mention of him again till the long residence which Paul made at Ephesus. Thither the Corinthian Church sent three deputies, to consult with Paul upon the unbecoming dissension and abuses which during his absence had arisen among them. The Apostle sent Timothy and Titus back with the First Epistle, and with authority to compose those unseemly differences. Here these two Evangelists stopped a considerable time, and, as we learn from the Second Epistle to the same Church, were completely successful in the object of their mission. Paul had expected his return into Asia with an account of the effect of his remonstrances and instructions, but the time passing on without his arrival, the Apostle sailed to Macedonia, full of anxiety to know the state of affairs at Corinth. Here he met Titus, who gave him an account which filled him with joy for the complete and happy reformation which had been wrought. Titus was sent back with the Second Epistle, and we conclude that he continued to labour there till he was joined by Paul. On this occasion the Apostle stopped three months, and then returned with the contributions of the Churches to the poor Christians of Judea. Titus is not mentioned as one of the company on that occasion, though he may have gone to Jerusalem, ministered to Paul's wants at Casarea, and even sailed with him to Rome, when he appealed his case to the imperial tribunal. To this supposition the very natural objection occurs, that his name is not mentioned in any of the salutations appended to the epistles

which were written by Paul during that two years' imprisonment. We have only to conjecture then at what time Paul left Titus in Crete—whether it was when the vessel in which he sailed to Rome was detained a considerable time by contrary winds at several ports in the south side of that island, or when he visited it after his acquittal at Rome. We can scarcely suppose that on the first of these occasions, when he was a prisoner, he would be permitted to travel over the island and preach the Gospel. We are led to the conclusion that Titus might have of his own accord visited that isle “of a hundred cities,” in which there were many Jews, as we learn from Josephus, and from which there were Gentile proselytes at Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, when the first great conversion to the Gospel took place. It is agreed that Paul visited Crete after leaving Italy, and we can readily believe that in such a wide field and such a populous city he had not time to “set every thing in order, and ordain elders in every city,” as he left Titus with authority to do after his departure. The Cretan character was proverbially bad among the whole of the Greeks. “To talk like a Cretan” was equivalent to *lying* and *deceit*. St Paul in this Epistle to Titus quotes a verse of a lyric poet of the island (Epimenides) which describes them not only as liars, but as rapacious thieves, and lazy sensualists and gluttons, adding his own testimony to the truth of the poet's censure. Among the professors of the Christian truth, there were many of very inconsistent conduct professing to know God; in works they denied him, being abominable and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate. Paul therefore exhorts Titus not only to exhibit all the graces of the Christian character in himself, but to “rebuke sharply” all who showed themselves unworthy of the name and profession which they had taken upon them. This letter is supposed to have been written from Colosse in the summer of the year 64.

It is probable that Titus continued to

discharge this duty faithfully for a considerable part of a year. Paul in the conclusion requests him to come to Nicopolis, supposed to be that in Epirus in the Venetian Gulf, where he was to spend the winter. We learn that Titus was assisted in the work of settling the Churches of Crete by the eloquent Apollos and others, and that his absence was to be supplied by Artemas and Tychicus. We have reason to conclude that Titus complied with Paul's request, and spent the winter with him at Nicopolis; and we may suppose also that they preached the Gospel in that city in the province of Epirus, and as far north as Dalmatia. We learn, however, from the Second Epistle to Timothy that Paul, along with Titus and other associates, visited Crete the following year, probably early in the season, induced no doubt by the account which Titus gave of the state of affairs in the island. We have no means of discovering how long they continued there, but it is certain that Paul and Titus went to Rome that same year (A.D. 65) or early in the next, when the first fiery persecution was cutting off multitudes of Christians. The terrors of that bloody scene of indiscriminate injustice and cruelty drove away many of the dauntless Apostle's fellow-labourers. Among those who left him he mentions Titus, who had gone to Dalmatia. As he requests Timothy and Mark to come to his aid even from Ephesus, we may be justified in supposing that Titus had fled from the field of dangerous warfare, for which he might not feel himself equal. We have the general consent of ancient church historians, that Titus returned to Crete after this bloody storm was blown over. Some are anxious to believe that he resided permanently there as in an episcopal diocese, the charge of which he had received from Paul. Whitby, in his introduction to the Epistle addressed to Titus, proves that the office of Apostle and Evangelist was not confined to localities—that both had received commission to preach the Gospel to all nations, and that after they had firmly planted the truth and appointed

teachers in one place, it was their understood duty as well as regular practice to visit other nations and districts where the light of the truth had not yet shone. Unless this had been the practice and the understood duty, Paul could not have said with truth, as he does to the Colossians, that the Gospel had been "preached to every creature under heaven." We have no farther account of this Evangelist's labours in Crete or elsewhere. We learn only that he lived till he was ninety-four years old, and died in peace, and was buried in Crete. Those who know the character of the younger Pliny, and have read his letter to Trajan in regard to the persecution and punishment of Christians, will give no credit to the report that Titus converted him to Christianity while proconsul of Bithynia. The success of Paul's labour and that of Titus and the other Evangelists, in sowing the seeds of truth and of a better morality, was so great and permanent, that even till this day they remain, and the char-

acter of the lying and sensual *Canon* of old may be found elsewhere among the islands of Greece in much greater features than among the modern Can-dioties.

TOLA, a Judge of Israel, of the tribe of Issachar, whose administration continued twenty-three years. The enemies from whom he delivered the Israelites are not named. It is thought that he governed only the northern tribes, and that Jair was his contemporary beyond that river.

TYCHICUS, mentioned with TROPHIMUS, as "of Asia," namely, Asia Minor, one of the companions of St Paul in his mission to Macedonia, is repeatedly mentioned by that Apostle, who calls him "a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord." The particulars recorded of him are few, but they afford proofs of the great confidence which the Apostle placed in him on account of his ability, faithfulness, and zeal in the cause of Christianity.

U

URIAH, or URIJAH, called the Hittite, the husband of Bathsheba. See DAVID.

URIJAH, the high priest in the reign of Ahaz, king of Judah, who basely complied with that idolatrous king's demands, and set up an altar after the model of one which Ahaz had seen at Damascus, in opposition to the altar of Jehovah. Also the name of a Prophet, the son of Shemaiah, mentioned by Jeremiah, who uttered a prediction against Jehoiakim, king of Judah, which irritated him to such a degree that Urijah was compelled to save his life by a flight into Egypt.

UZZIAH, also called AZARIAH, and OZEAS, was the son and successor of Amaziah, king of Judah. He succeeded to the throne in the sixteenth year of his age, in the year B.C. 810 or 811. He began his reign well, and "sought God in the days of Zechariah [not the

Prophet of that name whose Book is in the inspired canon], who had understanding in the visions of God, and as long as he sought the Lord, God made him to prosper." He conquered Elath, Gath, Jabesh, and Ashdod, gaining many advantages over the Philistines, and he defeated the Arabs of Gur-Baal, the Melunim, and the Ammonites. He had an army of 307,500 men; he built new fortifications, and repaired the old, providing them with suitable garrisons and military stores. Though he carried on successfully several wars, he did not neglect the arts of peace, for we find him advancing the interests of agriculture, and making great improvements in the pasturage and breed of cattle. In religion he was for the most part obedient to the Law, though he did not demolish the idolatrous altars. On one occasion, however, he attempted to usurp the privileges of

the priesthood, and for this act of impiety he was punished with leprosy, and he was obliged to reside by himself as a solitary recluse in a separate house during the remainder of his life. The affairs of government were administered by his son and successor Jotham. He died in the fifty-second year of his reign, and was buried in a sepulchre "in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings," as it

was deemed improper or illegal to defile the royal sepulchres with a leprous body. The year of Uzziah's death was distinguished by the remarkable vision of Isaiah, when he was designated to the prophetic office. The famous era of the Olympiads commenced in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Uzziah, in the 199th year of the revolt of the Ten Tribes, and B.C. 776.

VASHTI, the beautiful queen of Ahasuerus, king of Persia, who displeased that monarch by refusing to appear before him and his courtiers at his command, to "shew the people and the princes her beauty," and who was in consequence deprived of her regal dignity. "The conduct of Ahasuerus with respect to Queen Vashti," says Bishop Hall, "it must be recollected, was that of an heathen acting under the influence

of anger and intemperance. It is recorded in Scripture, not that it may be imitated or alleged as a pretence for sin, but that we may derive improvement by observing the events to which it led—his silent will, although apparently ungoverned, being nevertheless so directed by Providence that it brought forward the remarkable preservation of the Jews, which forms the chief subject of the Book of Esther." See ESTHER.

ZACCHEUS, an inhabitant of Jericho, described as rich, and the "chief among the publicans." It is probable that he was originally a Jew, yet all publicans, on account of the nature of their office as tax-gatherers, were in general considered as Gentiles by the Jews. It appears that Zaccheus was a man of short stature, and in his anxiety to obtain a sight of Christ he climbed a sycamore tree to see him pass. In this situation he attracted the attention of our Saviour, who intimated to him that he would "abide with him that day" at his house. Zaccheus hastened to descend from his elevated position and received Jesus joyfully. When the Pharisees saw this, they indignantly said that "he was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner." Zaccheus heard the charge, and did not deny it. He confessed that he

was a great sinner, probably understanding the charge as referring to some acts of oppressive extortion committed by him in his capacity of publican, or tax-gatherer, but he declared the sincerity of his repentance by his actions:—"Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold." The *false accusation* means by giving wrong information against any person respecting the duties payable to the government. He restored *fourfold*, not by adding a fifth part, which was required by the Law in the case of theft, nor by restoring double, as when what was taken was found in the trespasser's hands, but by restoring for money and goods what the rigour of the Law only required when an ox or a sheep was killed after being stolen. The sin-

cerity of Zaccheus is proved by our Saviour's reply to him—"This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham"—namely, Zaccheus acted like a true son of Abraham, and ought to be regarded as one of God's faithful servants.

ZACHARIAH, the son and successor of Jeroboam II., king of the Ten Tribes, ascended the throne about B.C. 773. He did "that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, as his fathers had done," and after a reign of only six months he was murdered by Shallum, who usurped his throne. The prediction that the family of Jehu would retain the kingdom to the fourth generation was thus fulfilled.

ZACHARIAH, a man having "understanding in the visions of God," who lived in the reign of Uzziah, king of Judah. This is not the Zachariah, or Zechariah, the Prophet, for he flourished three hundred years afterwards, but probably the son of that Zachariah, the son of Jehoiada, and called after his father, who was slain some years before. As it is not stated that he was a prophet, he was perhaps merely an expounder of the ancient prophecies, and eminent for his wisdom and piety.

ZADOK, a celebrated high priest in the time of David. See **DAVID**.

ZECHARIAH, or **ZACHARIAH**, one of the last of the Twelve Minor Prophets, is supposed to have delivered his predictions from B.C. 520 to B.C. 518, or longer. It is certain that he was of the number of the Captivity who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem in consequence of the decree of Cyrus, and he must have been then very young, for he describes himself as a "young man" nearly seventeen years afterwards, when he had commenced his prophetic functions. In the first chapter of his Prophecy he styles himself the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo, but in the Book of Ezra he is simply called the son of Iddo (v. 1; vi. 14), which may be accounted for on the supposition that his father died before the return from Baby-

lon, or before his grandfather Iddo, and consequently Zechariah would be better known in connection with his surviving grandfather, with whom he resided, and to whose inheritance he was next in succession. In the year B.C. 520, Zechariah commenced his prophetic career by a serious call to repentance. In the same year we find him and the Prophet Haggai assisting the endeavours of Zerubbabel and Jeshua to animate the people of Jerusalem to prosecute the great work of rebuilding the Temple, and for this purpose he communicated the visions contained in the first six chapters of his prophetic Book, which he divinely received on the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month of that year. All these visions, as announced to the Jews, tended to inspire the strongest hopes and assurance of future prosperity through the returning favour of Jehovah, and thus would convince those to whom they were addressed that their labours would not be useless. The same design is evidently indicated in a revelation made two years afterwards, which is the subject of the seventh and eighth chapters.

"Thus far," says Dr Blayney, "with regard to the former part of these prophecies, the time and occasion are ascertained by the dates annexed to them, from whence the general scope of them is easily deducible, but with respect to those which follow we are left more in the way of conjecture. It is, however, highly probable, from the apparent difference both of style and subject, that they came forth at a different and more advanced period of our Prophet's life. It is not at all surprising if this writer, as he advanced in years and dignity, should have learned to express himself in a tone of more elevation and energy. At such distant periods also, as we suppose, the subject of course would be materially changed, for he would no longer have occasion to stimulate his countrymen to the building of the Temple, which was already completely finished, but he was actually engaged in predicting some remarkable occurrences which would distinguish his

own and the neighbouring nations in remote periods, some of them perhaps not yet arrived, and in urging an immediate reformation of national manners. In doing so, what more natural to expect than that he would encounter hatred and opposition from those whose corruptions he was called upon to censure and repress? Accordingly, there is sufficient ground to conclude that all this happened to him, from what he says in the eleventh chapter of the freedom and zeal with which he exposed and counteracted the iniquitous conduct of those who made merchandise of the flock, meaning those unprincipled guides who assumed the direction of the people for no better purpose than to sacrifice them to the gratification of their own ambition and avarice. Several of these, by exhibiting in himself the contrast of a good shepherd, he found means at first to deprive at least of the influence and authority which they once possessed and had wickedly abused. The sequel may be easily conjectured, for from similar causes similar effects may naturally be expected. His enraged adversaries, after thwarting and defeating all his endeavours for the public good, at length, no doubt by intrigue and misrepresentation, so far succeeded as to turn the tide of popular prejudice and resentment against him, and he was barbarously murdered, as his namesake Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, had been for the same cause, and in the self same place, between three and four hundred years before. For this we have no less authority than that of our blessed Lord, who expressly calls the person of whom he speaks (Matt. xxiii. 35) *Zacharias, son of Barachias*, distinguishing him from the before mentioned Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, by his patronymic, as effectually as two men bearing the same Christian name in our days would be distinguished by their family names. *Both were priests as well as prophets, and therefore that both should suffer nearly on the same spot will appear less surprising, when we recollect that the space between the porch and the altar was the court of the priests, appro-

priated to them for the public exercise of their sacred ministry."

Zechariah is supposed to have collected his own prophecies in their present form. His style so greatly resembles that of Jeremiah, that the Jews considered the spirit of that distinguished Prophet to have passed into him. He was so remarkable for the peculiar excellency of his predictions as to be styled the *sun among the Lesser Prophets*, but it is, as Dr Gray happily observes, the sun sometimes clouded by obscurity. "That he is in some degree obscure, and hard to be understood," says Dr Blayney, "is not to be questioned, and which of the ancient prophets is not so? It is the nature of prophecy to affect a degree of abstruseness before the accomplishment, in order not to clash with the freedom of human agency; and there is no doubt that some of Zechariah's predictions relate to matters which are still involved in futurity. No wonder, then, that these fall not within the reach of our comprehension. Others there are which we have good reason to believe have been already fulfilled, but which do not appear with such a degree of evidence as they probably would have done if we had been better informed concerning the times and facts to which they relate. With respect to the emblems and types which are exhibited, most of them are of easy and determinate application; and in favour of the importance of his subject-matter it must be acknowledged that, next to Isaiah, Zechariah is the most evangelical of all the Prophets, having more frequent, clear, and direct allusions to the character and coming of the Messiah and his kingdom than any of the others. Upon the whole, we shall find the diction remarkably pure, the construction natural and perspicuous, and the style judiciously varied according to the nature of the subject—simple and plain in the narrative and historical parts, but in those which are wholly prophetic, the latter chapters rising to a degree of elevation and grandeur scarcely inferior to the most sublime of the inspired writings."

ZEDEKIAH, originally called **Mataniah**, was placed on the throne by **Nebuchadnezzar**, who deposed his brother **Jehoiachin**, B.C. 599. He was twenty-one years of age when he became the tributary of the Babylonian conqueror, and he reigned eleven years. He did "that which was evil in the sight of the Lord his God, and humbled not himself before Jeremiah the prophet speaking from the mouth of the Lord." In the ninth year of his reign Zedekiah was induced to renounce his allegiance to **Nebuchadnezzar**, and to make an alliance with **Pharaoh-Hophra**, king of Egypt. The Chaldean army immediately laid siege to Jerusalem. The Egyptians came up to relieve the city, but the conquering forces marched against them, and they retreated to Egypt without hazarding a battle. The siege was then resumed, and the city was taken in the eleventh year of Zedekiah's reign. The king attempted to escape by night, but he was overtaken and carried prisoner to **Nebuchadnezzar**, who was then encamped at **Riblah** in the province of **Hamath**. Here his two sons were put to death in his presence, and then his own eyes were put out, in which condition he was led in chains to **Babylon**. Zedekiah was the last king of **Judah** of the race of **David**. The city of **Jerusalem** was destroyed, and the Hebrews were doomed to suffer what is known as the **Babylonian Captivity**.

ZELOTES. See **PETER**.

ZENAS, a "lawyer," mentioned by **St Paul** in his Epistle to **Titus**. He was either a teacher of the **Mosaic Law**, or a **Roman lawyer**, probably the latter, who had been an early convert to Christianity. It appears that **Zenas** and **Apollon** were to pass through **Crete**, either on their way to the **Apostle**, or to some other place to which he had sent them, and he desires **Titus** to afford them every facility in his power for their journey.

ZEPHANIAH, one of the **Minor Prophets**, who flourished from B.C. 640 to B.C. 602 in the reign of **Josiah** king of **Judah**. He informs us that he was the

son of **Cushi**, and he is supposed to have been of the tribe of **Simeon**, and of distinguished rank. **Epiphanius** relates that he was born at a place called **Mount Sacabatha**, or **Bathaca**. Nothing farther is known of his history. The style of **Zephaniah** is poetical, and generally animated and impressive, though it is not distinguished by any peculiar elegance or beauty. He greatly resembles **Jeremiah** in those passages of his prophecy which treat of the idolatry and wickedness then prevalent. He seems to have been a zealous co-operator with **King Josiah** in bringing back the Hebrews to the worship of **Jehovah**.

ZERUBBABEL, the son of **Shealtiel**, a distinguished governor of the Hebrews in the time of **Darius**, king of **Persia**, who is repeatedly mentioned by the **Prophets Haggai** and **Zechariah**. He was of the royal family of **David**—a grandson of **King Jehoiachin**, and is emphatically designated the "prince of **Judah**," by his **Babylonish** name **Sheshbazzar**, for during the Captivity it was common among the Jews to bear two names, the one **Hebrew** and the other **Babylonish**. **Cyrus** delivered to him all the sacred vessels which had been carried off by **Nebuchadnezzar** to **Babylon**, namely, "thirty chargers of gold, a thousand chargers of silver, nine and twenty knives, thirty basons of gold, silver basons of a second sort four hundred and ten, and other vessels a thousand. All the vessels of gold and silver were five thousand and four hundred." He led the first caravan of the Hebrews at the return from Captivity, and after arriving at the long desolated **Jerusalem**, ordered the festivals and sacred services, appointed the **Levites** "from twenty years old and upward to set forward the work of the Lord's house," and vigorously prosecuted the work of restoration, notwithstanding the opposition he encountered from the **Samaritans** and other "adversaries of **Judah** and **Benjamin**." The proceedings of **Zerubbabel** are recorded by **Ezra** his successor, but of his personal history little is known.

ZIMRI, one of the chief officers of Baasha, king of the Ten Tribes, and of his son and successor Elah, the latter of whom he murdered, and usurped his throne. His reign, however, if it may be so called, was only seven days. He was besieged by Omri in Tirzah. and when he found that it was impossible to avert being taken, he set fire to his palace, and was consumed in the conflagration. ZIPPORAH, the daughter of Jethro and the wife of Moses. See MOSES.

**LIST OF PERSONS MENTIONED IN THE SCRIPTURES OF WHOM LITTLE
IS KNOWN, AND OCCASIONALLY NOTICED IN THIS WORK.**

ABAGTHA, an officer of King Ahasuerus, Esther i. 10. It is probably a Persian word, and of unknown import.

ABDA, father of Adoniram, one of Solomon's officers, 1 Kings iv. 6.

ABDI, or **OBDI**, son of Malluch, a Merarite, 1 Chron. vi. 44.

ABDIEL, son of Guni, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. v. 15.

ABDIEL, or **ABDEEL**, father of Shemaiah, Jer. xxxvi. 26.

ABDON, of Benjamin, son of Jehiel and Maachab, 1 Chron. ix. 36.

ABDON, son of Micah, sent by King Josiah to Huldah the Prophetess, to ask her opinion concerning the book of the Law found in the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 20. Some conjecture that he is the same as Achbor, son of Micaiah, 2 Kings xxii. 12.

ABEDNEGO, or **OBEDNEGO**, signifying *servant of light*, or *servant of Nego*, a Chaldee name given by the king of Babylon's officer to Azariah, one of Daniel's companions, Dan. i. 7. He was thrown into the furnace at Babylon, with Shadrach and Meshach, for refusing to worship the statue erected by command of Nebuchadnezzar.

ABI, mother of Hezekiah, king of Judah, 2 Kings xviii. 2. She is also called Abijah, 2 Chron. xxix. 1, and Abiah.

ABIAH, the second son of Samuel, who was entrusted with the administration of justice, but behaved so corruptly that he was one of the ostensible causes of the Israelites demanding a king, 1 Sam. viii. 2.

ABI-AL, son of Zeror, 1 Sam. ix. 1, called **ABI-ALBON**, 2 Sam. xxiii. 31, a

gallant warrior in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 32.

ABIASAPH, son of Korah, Exod. vi. 24, called **EBIASAPH**, 1 Chron. vi. 23; ix. 19.

ABIASAPH, son of Elkanah, one of the Levites set over the singing, 1 Chron. vi. 23.

ABIDA, son of Midian, and grandson of Abraham, Gen. xxv. 4.

ABIDAN, son of Gideon, of the tribe of Benjamin, and prince of that tribe when the tabernacle was erected in the Wilderness, Numb. i. 11. His offering was similar to that of the chiefs of the other tribes, Numb. vii. 60.

ABIEL, or **JEHIEL**, father of Kish and Ner, and grandfather of King Saul, 1 Sam. ix. 1.

ABIEZER, son of Manasseh, Josh. xvii. 2.

ABIEZER, Judges vi. 34.

ABIEZER, of Anathoth of Benjamin, one of the thirty gallant men of David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 27; 1 Chron. xi. 28.

ABI-GABEON, also called **NER**, father of Abdon and Kish, ancestor of Saul, and the husband of Maachab, 1 Chron. viii. 29.

ABIGAIL, sister of David, wife of Jether, or Ithra, and mother of Amasa, 1 Chron. xi. 17.

ABIHAIL, son of Huri, and father of Michael and other sons, 1 Chron. v. 13, 14.

ABIHAIL, father of Zuriel, of the family of Merari, Numb. iii. 35.

ABIHAIL, daughter of Eliab, David's brother, and the wife of Rehoboam, king of Judah, 2 Chron. xi. 18.

ABIHAIL, father of Queen Esther, and the brother of Mordecai, Esther ii. 15.

ABIJAH, a descendant of Eleazar, son of Aaron, was chief of one of the twenty-four companies of priests distributed into classes by David, 1 Chron. xxiv. 10.

ABIMAEEL, a son of Joktan, Gen. x. 28.

ABINADAB, a son of Saul.

ABINADAB, a brother of David, 1 Chron. ii. 13.

ABINADAB, a Levite of Kirjath-jearim.

ABINOAM, father of Barak, leader of the army, Judges iv. 6.

ABIRAM, the eldest son of Hiel the Bethelite, 1 Kings xvi. 34.

ABISHAG, a young and beautiful woman of Shunam, in the tribe of Issachar, 1 Kings ii. 17—25.

ABISHALOM, father of Maachah, who was mother of Abijah, king of Judah, 1 Kings xv. 2.

ABISHUA, son of Phinehas, fourth high priest of the Jews, 1 Chron. vi. 50.

ABISHUR, the son of Shammai of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 28.

ABITAL, sixth wife of David, 1 Chron. iii. 3.

ABITUB, the son of Hushim of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 11.

ABIUD, son of Zorobabel, one of our blessed Saviour's ancestors, Matt. i. 13.

ACHAICUS, a disciple of St Paul, who with Stephanus and Fortunatus carried his First Epistle to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 17.

ACHBOR, father of Baal-hanan, king of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 38.

ACHBOR, an officer of King Josiah, 2 Kings xxii. 14.

ACHBOR, father of Elnathan, Jer. xxvi. 22.

ACHIM, son of Zadok, father of Ehud, of the tribe of Judah and family of David, in the genealogy of our Saviour, Matt. i. 14.

ACHIRAM, or **AHIRAM**, of the tribe of Benjamin, chief of a great family when the Israelites left Egypt, Numb. xxvi. 38.

ADAH, or **ODEH**, one of Lamech's two wives, and mother of Jabal and Jubal, Gen. iv. 19.

ADAH, daughter of Elon the Hittite and wife of Esau, by whom she had Eliphaz, Gen. xxxvi. 4.

ADALIAH, or **ODIEH**, of the tribe of Levi, son of Ethan, and father of Zerach, 1 Chron. vi. 41.

ADALIAH, of the tribe of Benjamin, son of Shimhi, 1 Chron. viii. 21.

ADALIAH, of the priests, son of Jeroham, and father of Maasai, 1 Chron. ix. 12.

ADALIAH, a Jew who returned from Babylon, and dismissed his wife, whom he had married contrary to the Law, Ezra x. 27.

ADALIAH, the fifth son of Haman, hanged with his brothers by order of Ahasuerus, Esther ix. 8.

ADBEEL, or **ADBAL**, third son of Ishmael, head of a tribe of Ishmaelites, Gen. xxv. 13.

ADDAN, or **ADDON**, a person who was excluded from the true Hebrews at the return from Babylon, because he was unable to prove his pedigree, Ezra ii. 59; Neh. vii. 61.

ADDAR, son of Bela, son of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 3.

ADDI, son of Cosam, and father of Melchi, in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 28.

ADDON, one of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon, Neh. vii. 61.

ADER, a person who took the city of Gath, 1 Chron. viii. 15.

ADIEL, son of Adiel, of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

ADLAI, father of Shaphat, who was principal herdsman to King David, 1 Chron. xxvii. 29.

ADMATHA, one of the seven principal officers of the court of Ahasuerus, Esther i. 14.

ADNA, a Levite who dismissed his wife, having married contrary to the Law, Ezra x. 30.

ADNAH, or **ADINA**, a valiant man of Manasseh, who espoused David's cause, 1 Chron. xii. 20.

ADNAH, general of the troops of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, 2 Chron. xvii. 14.

ADONIKAM, one who returned from

Babylon with six hundred men of his own family, Ezra ii. 13.

ADONIRAM, receiver of Solomon's tributes, and chief directory of the thirty thousand men employed in cutting timber, 1 Kings v. 14.

ADORAM, son of the king of Hamath, who was sent by his father to congratulate David on his victory over Hadarezer, king of Syria, 1 Chron. xviii. 10. He is also called Joram, 2 Sam. xviii. 24.

ADORAM, receiver general of the tributes in the reign of David, 2 Sam. xx. 24.

ADORAM, probably the son of the preceding, held the same situation at the accession of Rehoboam, was put to death by the exasperated tribes, 1 Kings xii. 18.

ADRAMMELECH, a son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, Isa. xxxvii. 38.

ADRIEL, son of Barzilla, married Merab, daughter of Saul, who had been promised to David, 1 Sam. xviii. 19.

AGEE, father of Shamhah, a valiant man in David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 11.

AHARAH, third son of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 1.

AHARHEL, son of Harum, 1 Chron. iv. 8.

AHASBAI, father of Eliphelet, one of David's valiant men, 2 Sam. xxiii. 34.

AHAZ, a descendant of Saul, and father of Jehoadah, 1 Chron. viii. 36.

AHER, a Benjamite, 1 Chron. vii. 12.

AHI, son of Shomer, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 34.

AHIAH, son of Shisha, was Solomon's secretary, 1 Kings iv. 4.

AHIAH, son and successor of the high priest Abitub, 1 Sam. xiv. 3.

AHIAH, son of Naaman, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 7.

AHIAM, an officer in David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 33.

AHIAN, son of Shemida, 1 Chron. vii. 19.

AHIEZER, son of Ammishaddai, and chief of the tribe of Dan, who came out of Egypt at the head of 72,000 men of his tribe. His offering was the same as that of the other tribes, Numb. vii. 66.

AHIHUD, son of Naaman, and bro-

ther of Ahoab, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 7.

AHIJAH, father of Baasha, king of Israel, who killed Nadab, son of Jeroboam, and usurped his kingdom, 1 Kings xv. 27.

AHIJAH, son of Pelon, a brave officer in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 36.

AHIJAH, keeper of the treasury of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 20.

AHIJAH, son of Esron, of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 25.

AHIKAM, son of Shaphan, and father of Gedaliah, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 20.

AHILUD, the father of David's secretary named Jehoshaphat, 2 Sam. viii. 16.

AHIMAAZ, son of Zadok the high priest, 2 Sam. xv. xvii.

AHIMAN, a man of gigantic stature, of the race of Anak, who resided at Hebron when the spies visited the land of Canaan. He was driven from Hebron when Caleb took that city.

AHIMOTH, son of Elkanah, 1 Chron. vi. 25.

AHINADAB, son of Iddo, was governor of the district of Mahanaim under Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 14.

AHINOAM, daughter of Ahimaaz, and wife of Saul, 1 Sam. xvi. 50.

AHINOAM, the second wife of David, and mother of Amnon. She was a native of Jezreel, 1 Sam. xxx. 5.

AHIO, was charged with the care of the Ark, in conjunction with his brother Uzzah, when David removed it from the house of Abinadab to Jerusalem, 1 Chron. xiii. 7.

AHION, son of Abi-gabeon and Maachah, 1 Chron. viii. 31.

AHIRA, son of Enan, chief of the tribe of Naphtali, at the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, Numb. ii. 29.

AHISAMACH, father of Aholiab, the artificer who constructed the tabernacle in the Wilderness of Arabia Petraea, Exod. xxxv. 34, 35.

AHISHAHAR, son of Bilhan, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

AHISHAR, the high steward of King Solomon's household, 1 Kings iv. 6.

AHILUB, son of Phinehas, and grandson of Eli the high priest, whom he succeeded, 1 Sam. iv. 2.

AHITUB, son of Amariah, and father of Zadok the high priest, 1 Chron. vi. 8. It is not certain whether he exercised that office.

AHIUD, son of Shelomi, of the tribe of Asher, appointed by Moses one of the commissioners for dividing the Promised Land, Numb. xxxiv. 27.

AHLAI, son of Sheshan, 1 Chron. ii. 31.

AHLAI, a warlike commander in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 41.

AHOBAN, or **AHBAN**, son of Abishur and Abihail, 1 Chron. ii. 29.

AHOHE, third son of Bela, and grandson of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 4. His descendants are called *Ahohites*.

AHOLIAB, son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan, appointed with Bezaleel to construct the tabernacle, Exod. xxxv. 34.

AHOLIBAMAH, one of the wives of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 2.

AHOLIBAMAH, a duke of Edom, 1 Chron. i. 52.

AHUMAI, son of Jahath, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 1.

AHUZAM, son of Naarah, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 6.

AHUZZATH, the friend of Abimelech, king of Gerar, Gen. xxvi. 26. Some understand this name in an appellative sense.

AIAH, mother of Rizpah, who was Saul's concubine. David delivered her children to the Gibeonites, who put them to death, 2 Sam. xxi. 8.

AJAH, son of Zibeon, of the race of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 24.

AKAN, son of Anah the Horite, Gen. xxxvi. 27.

AKKUB, son of Elivenai, and one of the porters in the Temple, 1 Chron. iii. 24; ix. 17.

ALAMETH, ninth son of Becher the son of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 8.

ALAMETH, son of Jehoadah, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 36.

ALEXANDER, son of Simon the Cyrenian, and brother of Rufus, who as-

sisted our blessed Saviour in carrying the cross to Mount Calvary, Mark xv. 21.

ALIAM, the eldest son of Shobal, son of Seir, 1 Chron. i. 40.

ALLON, son of Jedaiah, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 37.

ALMODAD, son of Joktan, Gen. x. 26.

ALPHÆUS, father of St James the Less, Matt. x. 3; Luke vi. 15.

ALPHÆUS, father of Levi, also called St Matthew, Mark ii. 14.

ALVAH, a duke of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 40.

ALVAN, the eldest son of Shoban, of the race of Esau, and the second prince of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 23.

AMAL, the fourth son of Hemel, 1 Chron. vii. 35.

AMALEK, the progenitor of the Amalekites, was the son of Eliphaz and Timna, and the grandson of Esau. He succeeded Gatam in the government of Edom, Gen. xxxviii. 12, 16. The Mahometans maintain that he was the son of Ham and grandson of Noah.

AMARIAH, eldest son of Meraioth, and father of the high priest Abitub. His name occurs, 1 Chron. vi. 7, 11.

AMARIAH, a Hebrew who separated from his foreign wife, Ezra x. 42.

AMARIAH, great-grandfather of the Prophet Zephaniah, and father of Gedaliah, Zeph. i. 1.

AMASA, son of Adlai, opposed the admission into Samaria of such captives as were taken from the kingdom of Judah in the reign of Ahaz, 2 Chron. xxviii. 12.

AMASAI, the son of Elkanah, probably the Levite so called who joined David in the desert with thirty gallant men when he was avoiding Saul, 1 Chron. vi. 25.

AMASHAI, the son of Azareel, was a priest of Jerusalem, Neh. xi. 13.

AMAZIAH, priest of the golden calves at Bethel set up by Jeroboam, Amos vii. 10.

AMAZIAH, the father of Jorhah, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 34.

AMELEC, father of Josiah, who was commanded by Ahab to keep the Prophet Micaiah in custody, 2 Chron. xviii. 25.

AMI, the chief of a family who returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 57.

AMINADAB, of the tribe of Judah, was the son of Amram, and father of Nason, and of Elisheba, the wife of Aaron, Exod. vi. 23.

AMINADAB, son of Koath, a brother of Korah, 1 Chron. vi. 21.

AMINADAB, or **ABINADAB**, a son of Saul, who was slain in the battle near Gilboa, 1 Sam. xxxi. 2.

AMINADAB, a Levite, and an inhabitant of Kirjath-jearim, with whom the ark was deposited after it was recovered from the Philistines, 1 Sam. vii. 1.

AMITTAI, father of the Prophet Jonah, 2 Kings xiv. 25; Jonah. i. 1.

AMIZADAB, son of Benaiah, who was a principal officer in David's army. His son, of the same name, commanded under him, 1 Chron. xxvii. 6.

AMMIEL, son of Gemal, of the tribe of Dan, one of the spies sent to survey Canaan, Numb. xiii. 12.

AMMIEL, a native of Lodebar in the tribe of Simeon, was father of Machir and of Bathsheba, who married Uriah the Hittite, 1 Chron. iii. 5; 2 Sam. ix. 4.

AMMIEL, son of Obbededom, a Levite, 1 Chron. xxvi. 5.

AMMIHUD, son of Ephraim, and father of Elishama, Numb. i. 10; 1 Chron. vii. 26.

AMMIHUD, of the tribe of Simeon, father of Shemuel, Numb. xxxiv. 20.

AMMIHUD, of the tribe of Naphtali, father of Pedahel, Numb. xxxiv. 28.

AMMIHUD, father of Talmai, king of Geshur, 2 Sam. xiii. 37.

AMMINADAB, the father of Nason, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. ii. 10.

AMMISADAI, the father of Abiezer, of the tribe of Dan, Numb. i. 12; x. 25.

AMMON, son of Lot, and father of the Ammonites, Gen. xix. 34, 38.

AMMON, the eldest son of David by his second wife Ahinoam, he was killed by Absalom, 2 Sam. xiii.

AMNON, son of Shimon, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

AMOK, a priest who returned from Babylon, Neh. xii. 7, 20.

AMON, governor of Samaria, 1 Kings xxii. 26.

AMOS, father of the Prophet Isaiah, who, according to the Rabbins, was also a prophet.

AMOS, son of NAHUM, and father of Mattathias in the recorded genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 25.

AMPLIAS, mentioned by St Paul as one whom he particularly loved, Rom. xvi. 8. Nothing is known of his history.

AMRAM, son of Kohath, of the tribe of Levi, married Jochebed, and was the father of Aaron, Moses, and their sister Miriam, Exod. vi. 20.

AMRAM, son of Bani, after the return from Babylon separated from his wife, Ezra x. 34.

AMRAPHEL, an ancient king of Shinar, confederated with Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and two other kings, to make war against the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, and the three neighbouring cities, Genesis xiv.

AMZI, a Levite, father of Hilkiath, 1 Chron. vi. 46.

AMZI, son of Zechariah, and father of Pelaliah, Neh. xi. 12.

ANAH, son of Zibeon, the Hivite, and father of Aholibamah, the wife of Esau, Gen. xxvi. 24.

ANANIAH, one of those who sealed the covenant, Neh. x. 22.

ANAK, the progenitor of a famous race of giants in Palestine, extirpated by Caleb, Josh. xv. 14; Judges i. 20.

ANAMIM, the second son of Mizraim, Gen. x. 13.

ANAN, or **ONEN**, one of those who sealed the covenant, Neh. x. 32.

ANANIAS, or **ANANIAH**, of the tribe of Benjamin, built a part of the wall of Jerusalem, Neh. xi. 32.

ANANIAS, one of the first Christians of Jerusalem, who in concert with his wife sold some property, some of the purchase money of which he secreted. Their lamentable fate is duly recorded, Acts v.

ANANIAS, a disciple of Christ at Damascus, who was divinely instructed to visit St Paul after his conversion and arrival in that city, Acts ix. 20.

ANATH, father of Shamgar, Judge of Israel, Judges iii. 31.

ANATHOTH, eighth son of Bceher, 1 Chron. vii. 8.

ANER, a Canaanite, who with his brother Eshcol joined his forces with those of Abraham in pursuit of Chedorlaomer, Amraphel, and the other kings, who had plundered Sodom and carried off Lot, Gen. xiv. 24.

ANI, or **UANI**, a Levitical musician who accompanied the ark when David brought it to Jerusalem, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

ANIAM, son of Shemida, of the tribe of Manasseh, 1 Chron. vii. 19.

ANNA, daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher, a prophetess, was a widow at the birth of our Saviour, Luke ii. 36, 37.

ANUB, son of Coz, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 8.

APELLES, mentioned by St Paul as "approved in Christ," Rom. xvi. 10.

APHIAH, of the tribe of Benjamin, an ancestor of King Saul, 1 Sam. ix. 1.

APHSES, head of the eighteenth sacerdotal family, of the twenty-four chosen by David for the Temple service, 1 Chron. xxiv. 15.

APPAIM, son of Nadab, 1 Chron. ii. 30.

ARAD, son of Beriah, 1 Chron. viii. 15.

ARAH, son of Ulla, and grandson of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 30.

ARAH, the name of a person whose descendants, seven hundred and seventy-five in number, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 5.

ARAM, son of Esrom, and father of Aminadab, Ruth iv. 19; Matt. i. 4; Luke iii. 33.

ARAM, son of Shamer, 1 Chron. vii. 34.

ARAN, son of Dishan, and brother of Uz, of the race of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 28.

ARANUAH, a Jebusite, who offered David not only his threshing-floor, but wood and oxen. The king purchased

them for six hundred shekels of gold, 1 Chron. xxi. 25.

ARCHIPPUS, mentioned by St Paul, Col. iv. 17.

ARD, the youngest son of Benjamin, Gen. xlv. 21.

ARD, son of Bela, of the tribe of Benjamin, Numb. xxvi. 40; called **ADDAN**, 1 Chron. viii. 3.

ARDON, son of Caleb and Azuba, 1 Chron. ii. 18.

ARELI, the youngest son of Gad, Gen. xlv. 16.

ARIDAI, the ninth son of Haman, Esther ix. 19.

ARIDATH, the sixth son of Haman, Esther ix. 8.

ARISTOBULUS, mentioned by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 10.

ARMONI, a son of Saul put to death by the Gibeonites, 2 Sam. xxi. 8.

AROD, fifth son of Gad, Numb. xxvi.

ARPHAXAD, son of Shem, and father of Salah, Gen. xi. 12.

ARTEMAS, a coadjutor of St Paul, sent by him to Crete, during the absence of Titus at Nicopolis, where the Apostle then resided, Tit. iii. 12.

ARZA, governor of Tirzah, formerly the capital of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, in whose house Zimri killed King Elah, 1 Kings xvi. 9.

ASA, son of Elkanah, a Levite, 1 Chron. ix. 16.

ASAH, son of Zeruiah, and brother of Joab, killed by Abner, 2 Sam. ii. 18, 19, &c.

ASAI, sent by Josiah to the Prophetess Huldah, 2 Kings xxii. 14.

ASAI, son of Asiel, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

ASAI, son of Haggai, 1 Chron. vi. 30.

ASAI, the first born of the Shilonites, 1 Chron. ix. 5.

ASAI, the chief of the sons of Merari, 1 Chron. xv. 6.

ASAPH, father of Joab, who was secretary to King Hezekiah, 2 Kings xviii. 18.

ASAREEL, son of Jehaleleel, 1 Chron. iv. 16.

ASASELAH, fourth son of Asaph,

master of the Temple music, 1 Chron. xxv. 2.

ASHBEL, second son of Benjamin, Numb. xxvi. 38; 1 Chron. viii. 1.

ASHER, son of Jacob and Zilpah, Gen. xlix. 20.

ASHKENAZ, eldest son of Gomer, Gen. x. 3.

ASHPENAZ, the governor of Nebuchadnezzar's eunuchs, Dan. i. 3.

ASHUATH, third son of Japheth, and grandson of Heber, 1 Chron. vii. 33.

ASHUR, son of Shem, who gave his name to Assyria, Gen. x. 11, 12.

ASHUR, father of Tekoa, 1 Chron. ii. 24.

ASIEL, father of Seraiah, 1 Chron. iv. 35.

ASNAH, one of the Nethinim, who returned from Babylon with Ezra (ii. 50).

ASNAPPER, king of Assyria, who sent the Cuthæans into Israel, and who is identified with Shalmanezzer or Esarhaddon, Ezra iv. 10.

ASPATHA, the third son of Haman, Esther ix. 7.

ASRIEL, son of Gilead, Numb. xxvi. 31.

ASRIEL, or ASHRIEL, son of Manasseh, Josh. xvii. 2; 1 Chron. vii. 14.

ASSER, son of Korah, a Levite, Exod. vii. 24; 1 Chron. vi. 22.

ASSER, son of Jeconiah, king of Judah, and brother of Salathiel in the genealogy of our Saviour, 1 Chron. iii. 17.

ATARAH, wife of Jerahmeel, and mother of Onam, 1 Chron. ii. 26.

ATER, a person whose descendants, ninety-eight in number, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 16.

ATHARAH, son of Uziah, Neh. xi. 4.

ATHALIAH, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 26.

ATHLAI, a Hebrew who divorced his wife, Ezra x. 28.

ATTAL, father of Nathan, 1 Chron. ii. 36.

ATTAL, a Gadite, who joined David in the Wilderness, 1 Chron. xii. 2.

ATTAL, a son of Rehoboam, king of Judah, 2 Chron. xi. 20.

AZARIAH, father of Shaphan, 2 Kings xxii. 3.

AZANIAH, a Levite, Neh. x. 9.

AZAREEL, one of the Korhites who went over to David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xii. 6; xxv. 18; xxvii. 22.

AZARIAH, high priest of the Jews, 1 Chron. vi. 9.

AZARIAH, son of Johanan, high priest of the Jews, 1 Chron. vi. 10.

AZARIAH, high priest in the reign of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxxi. 10.

AZARIAH, father of Seraiah, was the last high priest before the Captivity, 1 Chron. vi. 14.

AZARIAH, son of the high priest Zadok, 1 Kings iv. 2.

AZARIAH, son of Nathan, captain of Solomon's guards, 1 Kings iv. 5.

AZARIAH, father of Helez, and son of Jehu, 1 Chron. ii. 39.

AZARIAH, son of Uriel or Zephaniah, 1 Chron. vi. 36.

AZARIAH, son of Oded, and a prophet, 2 Chron. xv. 1.

AZARIAH, son of Obed, to whom the high priest Jehoida intimated that the young prince Joash was still alive, and who assisted to place him on the throne.

AZARIAH, the name of two sons of King Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xxi. 1, 2.

AZARIAH, son of Hoshai, accused the Prophet Jeremiah of deceiving the people, because he advised those Jews who remained after the transportation to Babylon not to go into Egypt, Jer. xliii. 2.

AZARIAH, also called ABEDNEGO, Dan. i. 7; iii. 19.

AZAZ, son of Shema, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 8.

AZAZIAH, a Levite, 2 Chron. xxxi. 13.

AZBUK, father of Nehemiah, and one who assisted to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 16.

AZEL, a Benjamite, son of Elasa, of the family of Cush, 1 Chron. viii. 37.

AZGAD, a person who returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 12.

AZIZA, son of Zattu, mentioned as putting away his wife, Exod. x. 27.

AZMAVETH, son of Beroni, one of David's thirty warlike men, 2 Sam. xxiii. 31.

AZMAVETH, son of Adiel, 1 Chron. xi. 33; xxvii. 25.

AZMAVETH, son of Jehoiadah, of the tribe of Benjamin, and of Saul's family, 1 Chron. viii. 36.

AZOR, son of Eliakim, in our Saviour's genealogy, Matt. i. 13.

AZRIEL, of Manasseh, a brave officer in the service of David, made superintendent of the tribe of Dan, 1 Chron. v. 24; xxvii. 22.

AZRIEL, father of Seraiah, Jer. xxxvi. 26.

AZRIEL, father of Jerimoth, 1 Chron. xxvii. 19.

AZRIKAM, son of Neariah, and a relative of David, 1 Chron. iii. 23.

AZRIKAM, son of Azel, and a relative of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 38.

AZRIKAM, a Levite, 1 Chron. ix. 14.

AZUBAH, wife of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 18.

AZUBAH, wife of Asa, king of Judah, and mother of King Jehoshaphat, 1 Kings xxii. 42.

AZUR, father of Hananiah, Jer. xxviii. 1.

AZUR, father of Jaazaniah, Exod. xi. 1.

AZUR, one of those who sealed the covenant, Neh. x. 17.

AZZAN, father of Paltiel, Numb. xxxiv. 26.

B

BAAL-HANAN, son of Achbor, succeeded Shaul in the kingdom of Edom, and was the seventh king, Gen. xxxvi. 38; 1 Chron. i. 49.

BAALIS, king of the Ammonites, sent Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, to kill Gedaliah, the governor of those Jews not carried captive to Babylon, Jer. xl. 14.

BAANA, son of Ahilud, governor of Taanach, Megiddo, and Bethshean, 1 Kings iv. 12.

BAANAH, a person in the service of Ishbosheth, son of Saul, who with Rechab assassinated him while reposing, 2 Sam. iv. 2.

BAANAH, father of Heleb, one of David's mighty men, 2 Sam. xxiii. 29.

BAANAH, one of the Israelites who returned with Zerubbabel to Judea, Ezra ii. 2.

BAARA, wife of Shaharim, divorced by him, 1 Chron. viii. 8.

BAASEIAH, son of Malchiah, a Levite, 1 Chron. vi. 40.

BAKBAKKAR, a Levite, employed in building the Temple, 1 Chron. ix. 15.

BAKBUK, one whose children returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 51.

BANI, a person whose children returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 10.

BANI, son of Shamer, a Levite of the family of Merari, 1 Chron. vi. 46.

BANI, a Gadite, one of the heroes of David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 36.

BARACHEL, father of Elihu the Buzite, Job xxxii. 2.

BARACHIAS, father of Zechariah, mentioned in the Gospel of St Matthew (xxiii. 35).

BARACHIAS, son of Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 20.

BARACHIAS, father of Asaph, a Levite, 1 Chron. vi. 39.

BARACHIAS, son of Asa, a Levite, 1 Chron. ix. 16.

BARHUMITE, an appellation of one of David's mighty men, 2 Sam. xxiii. 31; 1 Chron. xi. 33.

BAR-JONA, son of John, a name given by our Saviour to St Peter, Matt. xvi. 17.

BARKOS, a person whose children returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 53; Neh. vii. 55.

BAR-TIMEUS, a blind man of Jericho, who sat by the side of the public road begging when our Saviour passed that way to Jerusalem, Mark x. 46-52.

BARUCH, son of Zabbai, repaired part of the wall of Jerusalem after the

return from Babylon, Neh. iii. 20. He was the father of Maaseiah, Neh. xi. 5.

BARZILLAI, a native of Meholah, in the tribe of Simeon, father of Adriel, who married Michal, formerly the wife of David, 2 Sam. xxi. 8.

BARZILLAI, a priest who married a daughter of Barzillai the Gileadite, and friend of David, Neh. vii. 63.

BASHEMATH, daughter of Helon the Hittite, wife of Esau, Gen. xxvi. 34.

BASMATH, daughter of King Solomon, married to Ahimaaz of Naphtali, 1 Kings iv. 15.

BATHSHUA, a name of Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite, afterwards of King David, 1 Chron. iii. 5.

BAVAL, son of Henadad, contributed to rebuild Jerusalem after the Captivity, Neh. iii. 18.

BAZLUTH, the head of a family who returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 52.

BEALIAH, one of the thirty brave officers of David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 5.

BEBAI, the head of a family who returned from Babylon six hundred and twenty-three in number, Ezra ii. 11.

BECHER, son of Ephraim, chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 35.

BECHER, son of Benjamin, father of Zemira and others, Gen. xvi. 21; 1 Chron. vii. 6, 8.

BECHORATH, son of Apha, great-grandfather of Kish, father of Saul, 1 Sam. ix. 1.

BEDAD, father of Hadad the Edomite, Gen. xxxvi. 35; 1 Chron. i. 46.

BEDAN, a Judge of Israel mentioned in 1 Sam. xii. 11, of whom nothing is known. In the Septuagint he is understood to be Barak, but the Rabbins allege that he was Samson of the tribe of Dan.

BEDEIAH, a person who divorced his foreign wife after the return from Babylon, Ezra x. 35.

BECLIADA, a son of David, 1 Chron. xiv. 7.

BEERAH, head of the tribe of Reuben, carried into captivity by Tiglath-pileser, 1 Chron. v. 6.

BEERI, father of Judith, wife of Esau.

BEERI, father of the Prophet Hosea, Hos. i. 1.

BEGUAI, or **BIGUAI**, returned with his sons from Babylon under Zerubbabel, Ezra ii. 2, 14.

BELA, son of Beor, king of Dinhabah, in the east of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 32.

BELA, son of Benjamin, chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 38.

BELA, son of Ahaz, 1 Chron. v. 8.

BELTESHAZZAR, the name given to Daniel at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. i. 7.

BEN, one of the porters appointed to the Temple, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

BEN-ABINADAB, the son of Abinadab, governor of the territory of Dor, married Taphath, a daughter of Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 11.

BENAIAH, son of Jehoiada, succeeded Joab as commander-in-chief of Solomon's army, 1 Kings i. 36; ii. 29.

BENAIAH, or **BENANIAS**, son of Paath-Moab, separated from his foreign wife after his return from Babylon, Ezra x. 30, as did also two others of the same name.

BEN-HAIL, a personage sent by Jehoshaphat to the cities in his dominions to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 7.

BEN-HANAN, son of Shimon, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

BEN-HESED, governor of Sochoh and Hephher under Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 8.

BENJAMIN, the youngest son of Jacob and Rachel, Gen. xxxvi. 16, 17, &c. His mother died immediately after his birth, and with her last breath named him *Ben-oni*, or *son of my sorrow*, but his father called him *Benjamin*, or *son of my right hand*.

BENINU, a Levite, Neh. x. 13.

BENO, son of Jaaziah, a Merarite, 1 Chron. xxiv. 26.

BEN-ZOHEHETH, son of Ishi, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

BEOR, father of Bela, king of Dinhabah in Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 32.

BERACHAH, one of David's mighty men, 1 Chron. xii. 8.

BERAIAH, the son of Shimhi, 1 Chron. viii. 21.

BERI, son of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 36.

BERIAH, son of Asher, and father of Heber and Malchiel, Gen. xlii. 17.

BERIAH, one of the principal inhabitants of Ajalon, who drove away the people of Gath, 1 Chron. viii. 13.

BESAI, a Nethinim, whose family returned from Babylon, Neh. vii. 52.

BETH-GADER, a man of Caleb's family, 1 Chron. ii. 51.

BETH-RAPHA, son of Eshton, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 12.

BETHUEL, or **BATHUEL**, son of Nahor and Milcah, was Abraham's nephew, and father of Laban and Rebekah. He does not appear in the affair of Rebekah's marriage, Gen. xxiv. 50.

BEZALEEL, son of Uri, was a famous artificer, Exod. xxxi. 2; xxxv. 30.

BEZALEEL, one of the sons of Pathath-Moab, Ezra x. 30.

BEZAR, a person whose family returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 17; Neh. vii. 23.

BICHRI, the father of Sheba, who rebelled against David, 2 Sam. xx. 1, 2, *et seq.*

BIDHAR, captain of the guards to Jehu, king of Israel, 2 Kings ix. 25.

BIGTHAN, an officer of King Ahasuerus, whose conspiracy was discovered by Mordecai, Esther ii. 21. The name is not much different from *Bagoas*, which means *an eunuch*.

BIGVAI, and his family, returned from Babylon under Zerubbabel, Ezra ii. 2, 14.

BIGVAI, one who returned from Babylon with Ezra, Ezra viii. 14.

BILDAD, the Shuhite, one of Job's friends, descended from Shuah, son of Abraham and Keturah, Job ii. 11.

BILGAH, principal of the fifteenth band of priests established by David, 1 Chron. xxiv. 14.

BILHAH, Rachel's handmaid, mother of Dan and Naphtali, Gen. xxx. 3, 6, 8.

BILHAN, son of Jediasel, and father of Jeush, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

BILSHAN, a person who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, Ezra ii. 2; Neh. vii. 7.

BIMHAL, son of Japhlet, 1 Chron. vii. 33.

BINNUI, father of Hoadiah, a Levite, Ezra viii. 33.

BINNUI, an Israelite who separated from his foreign wife, Ezra x. 30.

BIRSHA, king of Gomorrah, at war with Chedorlaomer, Gen. xiv. 2.

BIRZAVITH, son of Malchiel, 1 Chron. vii. 31.

BISHLAM, an officer of the king of Persia, who wrote to Artaxerxes, desiring him to prohibit the Jews from rebuilding the Temple, Ezra iv. 7.

BITHIAH, daughter of Pharaoh, and wife of Mered, 1 Chron. iv. 18.

BIZTHA, one of the chamberlains of King Ahasuerus, Esther i. 10.

BLASTUS, an officer of King Agrippa, who favoured the treaty between Tyre and Zidon, Acts xii. 20.

BOANERGES, *son of thunder*, a name given by our Saviour to St John and St James, the sons of Zebedee, Mark iii. 17.

BOCHERU, son of Azel, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 38.

BOHAN, a Reubenite, who erected a stone to commemorate his exploits in the conquest of Canaan, Josh. xv. 6; xviii. 17.

BUKKI, son of Jogli, of the tribe of Dan, Numb. xxxiv. 22.

BUKKI, high priest of the Jews, son of Abishua, and father of Uzzi, 1 Chron. vi. 5.

BUKKIAH, a Levite, who played before the ark, 1 Chron. xxv. 4.

BUNAH, son of Jerahmeel, 1 Chron. ii. 25.

BUZ, son of Nahor and Milcah, and brother of Huz, Gen. xxii. 21.

BUZ, son of Abdiel, and father of Jahdo, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. v. 14.

BUZI, a priest, father of the Prophet Ezekiel, Ezek. i. 3.

C

CAINAN, one of the Antediluvian Patriarchs, the son of Enos, and father of Mahalaleel, Gen. v. 9.

CAINAN, son of Arphaxad, and father of Salah. His name is not in the Hebrew and Vulgate of Gen. xi. 12, 13, 14, but he is mentioned by St Luke between Salah and Arphaxad (iii. 36). He is admitted in the Septuagint, Gen. x. 24; xi. 12. The insertion of his name has been a subject of considerable discussion among commentators.

CALCOL, fourth son of Mahol, famous for his wisdom, 1 Kings iv. 31.

CALCOL, son of Zerah, 1 Chron. ii. 6.

CALEB, son of Hur, whose posterity peopled the whole country about Bethlehem, Kirjath-jearim, &c. 1 Chron. ii. 50.

CALEB, or **CHELUBAI**, son of Hezron, 1 Chron. ii. 9, 18, 24.

CARCAS, the Persian appellative of one of the eunuchs of King Ahasuerus, Esther i. 10.

CAREAH, father of Johanan, 2 Kings xxv. 23.

CARMI, fourth son of Reuben, and head of the Carmites, Numb. xxvi. 6.

CARMI, father of Achan, Josh. vii. 1, 18.

CARPUS, one of St Paul's followers, who resided at Troas, where the Apostle landed on one occasion, 2 Tim. iv. 13.

CARSHENA, a Persian appellative of one of the officers of King Ahasuerus, Esther i. 14.

CASLUHIM, an appellative of an ancient people the descendants of a son of Mizraim, otherwise Mizr, Gen. x. 14.

CHEDORLAOMER, king of Elam, Gen. xiv. 1.

CHELAL, an Israelite who returned from Babylon, and divorced his foreign wife, Ezra x. 35.

CHELUB, father of Ezri, 1 Chron. xxvii. 26.

CHELUBAI, son of Hezron, 1 Chron. ii. 9.

CHENAANAH, fourth son of Bilhan, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

CHENANI, a Levite, Neh. ix. 4.

CHENANIAH, a master of the sacred music, who officiated at the removal of the ark from the house of Obededom, 1 Chron. xv. 22.

CHEPHIRAH, son of Kirjath-arim, Ezra ii. 25.

CHERAN, youngest son of Dishon, son of Seir the Horite, Gen. xxxvi. 26.

CHESD, son of Nahor and Milcah, Gen. xxii. 22, supposed to have been the progenitor of the Chasdim, whom the Jews call the Chaldeans.

CHILEAB, son of David and Abigail, 2 Sam. iii. 3.

CHILION, son of Elimelech and Naomi, of Bethlehem, who during a famine retired with his father and mother from Canaan to the country of Moab, where he married a Moabitess named Orpah, and where he died, Ruth i.

CHIMHAM, son of Barzillai the Gileadite. He followed David to Jerusalem after the war with Absalom, and was liberally rewarded by the king, 2 Sam. xix. 37, 38.

CHISLON, the father of Elidad, of the tribe of Benjamin. He was one of those deputed to allot the Land of Canaan, Numb. xxxiv. 21.

CHLOE, a Christian female of Corinth, who gave St Paul intimations of the divisions in the church there, 1 Cor. i. 11.

CHUSHAN-RISHATHAIM, an ancient king of Mesopotamia, who oppressed the Israelites eight years, Judges iii. 8-10.

CHUZA, steward to Herod Agrippa, and husband of Joanna, Luke viii. 3.

COLHOZEH, father of Shallum, Neh. iii. 15.

CONOMAH, one of the principal officers placed by Hezekiah over the store-rooms he erected, 2 Chron. xxxi. 12.

COSAM, son of Elmodam, in the genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 28.

COZ, father of Anab and Zobeab, 1 Chron. iv. 8.

COZBI, daughter of the prince of the Midianites named Zur. She, with other women of that nation, seduced the principal Israelites to commit idolatry. Phinehas slew her and Zimri at the same time, Numb. xxv. 7-15.

CRISPUS, chief of the Jewish syna-

gogue at Corinth, was converted and baptized by St Paul, Acts xviii. 8.

CUSH, the eldest son of Ham, and father of Nimrod, Gen. x. 8.

CUSHI, brought the tidings of the defeat of Absalom to David, 2 Sam. xviii. 21.

CUSHI, father of Shilemiah, Jer. xxxvi. 14.

CUSHI, father of the Prophet Zephaniah, Zeph. i. 1.

D

DALAI AH, son of Elioenai, of David's family, 1 Chron. iii. 24.

DALPHON, one of the sons of Haman, Esther ix. 7.

DAN, the fifth son of Jacob, being his eldest by Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid, Gen. xxx. 4.

DANIEL, son of King David and Abigail, 1 Chron. iii. 1.

DANIEL, a priest, of Ithamar's family, who returned from Babylon, Ezra viii. 2.

DARA, son of Zerah, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 6.

DARDA, an eminent Levite, a musician, and famous for his wisdom, 1 Kings iv. 31.

DARKON, an Israelite who returned from Babylon, Neh. vii. 58.

DATHAN, son of Eliab, who conspired with Korah, and was involved in his lamentable fate, Numb. xvi. 1-33.

DEBIR, a king of Eglon, slain by Joshua, Josh. x. 3.

DEBORAH, Rebekah's nurse, who accompanied her mistress, and died in the household of Jacob. She was buried near Bethel under an oak tree, hence designated the *oak of weeping*, Gen. xxxv. 8.

DEDAN, a son of Cush, Gen. x. 7.

DEDAN, a descendant of Abraham, Gen. xxv. 3.

DEDAN, second son of Raamah, Gen. x. 7.

DELAIAH, a councillor of King Jehoiakim, who opposed the burning of Jeremiah's prophecy, Jer. xxxvi. 25.

DELAIAH, one of the race of the priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 18.

DEUEL, of the tribe of Gad, father of Eliasaph, Numb. vii. 47.

DIBLAIM, father of Gomer, who was the wife of the Prophet Hosea, Hos. i. 3.

DIDYMUS, a name of St Thomas the Apostle, signifying a *twin*.

DIKLAH, seventh son of Joktan, Gen. x. 27.

DINAH, daughter of Jacob and Leah, Gen. xxx. 21; xlix. 5-7. The Rabbins assert that she was married to Job, of which there is no proof or even probability.

DIOTREPES, mentioned by St John as one who did not receive with hospitality those whom that Apostle sent to him, and he prevented others also, 3 John 9.

DISHAN, a son of Seir the Horite, Gen. xxxvi. 21, 30.

DISHON, a son of Seir the Horite.

DODAN, one of David's captains, 1 Chron. xxvii. 4.

DODANIM, the youngest son of Javan, Gen. x. 2.

DODAVAH, father of Eliczer, 2 Chron. xx. 37.

DODO, one of David's mighty men, 2 Sam. xxiii. 9.

DRUMA, the mother of Abimelech, Judges viii. 31.

DRUSILLA was the third daughter

of Agrippa by Cypros, and wife of Felix, Acts xxiv. 24, 25.

DUMAH, a son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 14, and progenitor of one of the ancient Arab tribes.

E

EBAL, son of Shobal, descendant of Seir the Horite, Gen. xxxvi. 23.

EBED, father of Gaal, Judges ix. 26.

EBED, son of Jonathan, of Adin's family, who returned with fifty men from Babylon, Ezra viii. 6.

EBED-MELECH, a eunuch or servant of King Zedekiah, Jer. xxxviii. 7.

EBIASAPH, a Levite, son of Elkanah, and father of Assir, 1 Chron. vi. 23.

EDEN, son of Joab, 2 Chron. xxix. 12.

EDER, son of Mushi, 1 Chron. xxiii. 23.

EDOM, a name of Esau, Gen. xxv. 25, 30.

EGLAH, sixth wife of David, supposed by some to be the same as Michal, 2 Sam. iii. 5.

EGLON, king of Moab, who oppressed the Israelites eight years, Judges iii. 12-15.

EHI, the sixth son of Benjamin, called also Abiram, Gen. xlv. 21 ; Numb. xxvi. 38. In the Septuagint he is made the son of Bela, and grandson of Benjamin.

EHUD, son of Gera, a judge of Israel, who slew Eglon, king of Moab, Judges iii. 15.

EHUD, a son of Bilhan, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

EKAR, son of Ram, 1 Chron. ii. 27.

ELADAH, son of Tahath, and grandson of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 20.

ELAH, the successor of Aholibamah in the government of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 41.

ELAH, son of Baathia, king of Israel, assassinated by Zimri, 1 Kings xvi. 8, 9.

ELAM, son of Shem, Gen. x. 22.

ELAM, whose seventy descendants

returned from the Captivity with Zerubabel, Ezra viii. 7.

ELASAH, the son of Pashur, Ezra x. 22.

ELASAH, the son of Shaphan, one of the messengers by whom the Prophet Jeremiah sent a letter to the captives in Babylon, Jer. xxix. 3.

ELDAAH, son of Midian, and grandson of Abraham and Keturah, 1 Chron. i. 33.

ELDAD, a person appointed by Moses one of the Seventy Elders of the Israelites, Numb. xi. 24-29.

ELEAD, grandson of Ephraim, killed in Gath, 1 Chron. vii. 21.

ELEASAH, son of Helez, father of Sisamai, 1 Chron. ii. 39.

ELEAZAR, third son of Aaron, and his successor as high priest, Exod. xxvii. 1. **ELEAZAR**, of Gibeath, in Kirjath-jearim, the son of Aminadab, to whose care the ark was committed when returned by the Philistines, 1 Sam. vii. 1.

ELEAZAR, son of Dodo, one of the three heroes who broke through the camp of the Philistines to procure water for David from Bethlehem. This Eleazar also checked an army of the Philistines, and made great slaughter among them, 2 Sam. xxiii. 9 ; 1 Chron. xi. 12, 16, 17.

ELEAZAR, son of Eliud, and grandfather of Joseph, Matt. i. 15.

ELEAZAR, son of Mahali, and brother of Kish, 1 Chron. xxiii. 21.

ELHANAN, son of Dodo, a valiant man in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 20 ; 2 Sam. xxi. 19.

ELI, in our Saviour's genealogy probably the same as Joachim, father of Mary, Luke iii. 23.

ELIAB, son of Helon, prince of Zebulun, Numb. i. 9.

ELIAB, son of Jesse, and one of David's brothers, 1 Sam. xvi. 6.

ELIAB, son of Nahath, and father of Jeroham, of the tribe of Levi, 1 Chron. vi. 27.

ELIAB, a brave man in David's army who joined him at Ziklag, called also Eliabha the Shaalbonite, 2 Sam. xxiii. 22; 1 Chron. xii. 9.

ELIADA, a son of David, 2 Sam. v. 16; 1 Chron. iii. 8.

ELIADA, father of Rezon, 1 Kings xi. 23.

ELIADA, a general of Jehoshaphat's army, 2 Chron. xvii. 17.

ELIAH, the name of two persons, Ezra x. 21, 26.

ELIAKIM, of the race of the priests, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, Neh. xii. 41.

ELIAKIM, son of Hilkiah the high priest, whom he succeeded, 2 Sam. xviii. 18.

ELIAKIM, a name of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, 2 Kings xxiii. 34, 35.

ELIAKIM, son of Abihud, and father of Azor, Matt. i. 13.

ELIAM, father of Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, 2 Sam. xi. 3; called Ammiel, 1 Chron. iii. 5.

ELIAM, son of Abithophel of Gilon, one of the thirty gallant men in David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 34.

ELIAS, a name of the Prophet Elijah.

ELIASAPH, son of Deuel, prince of Gad, Numb. i. 14.

ELIATHAH, eighth son of Heman. He was in the twentieth class of Levites, and sang before the ark, 1 Chron. xxv. 27.

ELIDAD, son of Chislon, of the tribe of Benjamin, a deputy appointed to allot the Promised Land, Numb. xxxiv. 21.

ELIEL, of the tribe of Manasseh, a warrior who flourished in the reign of Jotham, king of Judah, and of Jeroboam II, king of Israel, 1 Chron. v. 24.

ELIEL, a Levite of Kohath's family, 1 Chron. vi. 34.

ELIEL, two persons so named who were firm supporters of David, 1 Chron. xi. 46, 47.

ELIEZER, the steward of the Patriarch Abraham. He was a native of Damascus. The Mahometans call him Damesback, and believe him to have been a black slave given to Abraham by Nimrod. Others contend that Eliezer had a son whom the Patriarch intended to be his heir before the birth of Isaac.

ELIEZER, son of Moses and Zipporah, was born in Midian during the sojourn of Moses in that country.

ELIEZER, a Levite, who blew the trumpet before the ark when David removed it to Jerusalem, 1 Chron. xv. 24.

ELIEZER, son of Zichri, of Reuben, commanded 24,000 of his tribe in the reign of Solomon, 1 Chron. xxvii. 16.

ELIEZER, son of Jorim in the genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 29.

ELIHOREPH, one of the secretaries and councillors of King Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 3.

ELIHU, son of Shemaiah, a brave man of the tribe of Manasseh who followed David, 1 Chron. xii. 20.

ELIHU, one of the porters of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 7.

ELIHU, a brother of David, 1 Chron. xxvii. 18.

ELIHU, one of Job's friends, Job xxxii. 2; xxxiv. 1.

ELIKA, the Harodite, one of the thirty brave officers of David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 25.

ELIMELECH, of Bethlehem, husband of Naomi, by whom he had two sons, Mahlon and Chelion. He and his sons died in the country of Moab, Ruth i.

ELIOENAI, son of Neariah, 1 Chron. iii. 23.

ELIOENAI, son of Asiel, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

ELIOENAI, son of Becher, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 8.

ELIOENAI, son of Asaph, was a porter at the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 3.

ELIOENAI, son of Zerabiah, returned from Babylon, Ezra x. 22.

ELIPHAL, son of Ur, a brave officer in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 35.

ELIPHALET, a son of David, 2 Sam. v. 16.

ELIPHALETH, the son of Ahasbai, was one of David's mighty men, 2 Sam. xxiii. 34.

ELIPHAZ, son of Esau and Adah, daughter of Elon, Gen. xxxvi. 10.

ELIPHAZ, of Teman, one of Job's friends, probably a descendant of Eliphaz, son of Esau, Job iv. 1.

ELIPHELEH, a Levite who assisted at the removal of the ark, 1 Chron. xv. 18, 21.

ELIPHELET, son of Isleth, 1 Chron. viii. 39.

ELISHAH, son of Javan, Gen. x. 4; Ezek. xxvii. 7.

ELISHAMA, son of Ammihud, prince of Ephraim, presented offerings to the tabernacle, Numb. vii. 48.

ELISHAMA, son of Jekamiah, 1 Chron. ii. 41.

ELISHAMA, father of Nathaniah, and grandfather of Ishmael, killed Gedaliah, the governor left by Nebuchadnezzar in Judea after the destruction of Jerusalem.

ELISHAMA, of the sacerdotal race, was sent with others by Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, to exhort the Ten Tribes to renounce idolatry, 2 Chron. xvii. 8.

ELISHAMA, the name of two sons of David, 1 Chron. iii. 6, 8.

ELISHAPHAT, son of Zichri, assisted the high priest Jehoiada to enthrone the young king Joash, 2 Chron. xxiii. 1, &c.

ELISHEBA, a name of Elisabeth.

ELISHEBA, the daughter of Aminadab, and wife of Aaron, Exod. vi. 23.

ELISHUA, a name of Elisha; also the name of a son of David born at Jerusalem, 2 Sam. v. 15.

ELIUD, son of Achim, and father of Eleazar in the genealogy of our Saviour, Matt. i. 14, 15.

ELIZAPHAN, son of Uzziel, uncle of Aaron, and head of the family of Kohath, Numb. iii. 30. Moses commanded

him to carry the dead bodies of Nadab and Abihu out of the camp, Lev. x. 4.

ELIZAPHAN, son of Parnach, of the tribe of Zebulun, a deputy appointed to divide the Land of Canaan, Numb. xxxiv. 25.

ELIZUR, or **ELISHUR**, son of She-deur, of the tribe of Reuben, Numb. i. 5; vii. 30.

ELKANAH, the second son of Korah, Exod. vi. 24; 1 Chron. vi. 26.

ELKANAH, father of the Prophet Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 1.

ELKANAH, the name of several persons mentioned 1 Chron. vi. *et al.*

ELMODAN is mentioned in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 28.

ELNAAM, the father of some brave men in the time of David, 1 Chron. xi. 46.

ELNATHAN, son of Achbor, and father of Nehusta, mother of King Jehoiakim, opposed the burning of Jeremiah's prophecies by that monarch, and was sent to Egypt to bring back the Prophet Uriah, Jer. xxvi. 22; xxxvi. 12.

ELON, the Hittite, father of Basemath, wife of Esau, Gen. xxvi. 34.

ELON, of the tribe of Zebulun, Numb. xxvi. 26.

ELPAAL, son of Hushim, 1 Chron. viii. 11.

ELUZAI, an officer in David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 5.

ELZABAD, son of Shemaiah, a Levite, was a porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 7.

ELZABAD, the name of one of the brave men in David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 12.

ENAN, father of Ahira, of Naphtali, head of his tribe in the time of Moses, Numb. i. 15.

ENEAS, a man of Lydda, who had lost the use of his limbs, and was restored by St Peter, Acts ix. 34.

ENOCH, son of Midian, and grandson of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 4.

ENOCH, eldest son of Reuben, Gen. xlv. 9.

EPHAH, eldest son of Midian, Isa. lx. 6.

EPHAH, son of Jahdia, 1 Chron. ii. 46.

EPHAH, a concubine of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 46.

EPHAR, a person whose sons Jeremiah notices, Jer. xl. 8.

EPHAR, second son of Midian, and brother of Ephah, dwelt beyond Jordan, 1 Kings iv. 10; 1 Chron. i. 33.

EPHER, son of Manasseh, 1 Chron. iv. 17.

EPHER, son of Manasseh, 1 Chron. v. 24.

EPHLAH, son of Zahad, 1 Chron. ii. 37.

EPHRAIM, the second son of Joseph, and father of the tribe of Ephraim, Gen. xlviii. 13-19; 1 Chron. vii. 20, 21.

EPHRATH, Caleb's second wife, mother of Hur, is supposed to have given her name to Bethlehem, called also Ephratah, 1 Chron. ii. 19.

EPHRON, son of Zohar, sold the cave of Machpelah to Abraham, Gen. xxiii.

ERI, son of Gad, and head of a family, Gen. xlv. 16; Numb. xxvi. 16.

ESHBAAI, or **ISH-BOSHETH**, fourth son of Saul, 2 Sam. ii. 8.

ESHBAN, son of Dishon, the son of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 26.

ESHCOL, one of Abraham's allies in the Plain of Mamre, who accompanied him in pursuit of Chedorlaomer and the confederated kings, Gen. xiv. 24.

ESHEK, son of Mola, 1 Chron. vii. 39.

ESHTEMOA, son of Ishbah, 1 Chron. iv. 17.

ESHTEMOA, son of Hodiah, 1 Chron. iv. 19.

ESHTON, son of Mehir, and father of Beth-rapha, 1 Chron. iv. 11, 12.

ESLI, son of Nagge in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 25.

ESROM, son of Phares, and father of Aram, Ruth iv. 18; Matt. i. 3.

ETHAN, the Ezrahite, the son of Kishi, of the tribe of Levi, and family of Merari, is mentioned as only inferior to Solomon in wisdom, 1 Kings iv. 31. He was likewise called Jeduthun, and appears under this name in the titles to several Psalms. He was a principal master of the Temple music, 1 Chron. xv. 17, &c.

ETH-BAAL, king of the Zidonians, and father of Jezebel, queen of Ahab, 1 Kings xvi. 31.

ETHNAN, son of Helah, 1 Chron. iv. 7.

ETHNI, a Levite, and musician under David, 1 Chron. vi. 41.

EUBULUS, a disciple of St Paul, honoured by the Greek Church on the 28th of February, 2 Tim. iv. 21.

EVI, a prince of Midian who was slain in war, Numb. xxxi. 8.

EUTYCHUS, a young man of Troas, who sitting in a window while St Paul was preaching, slept, and fell from the third story. He was taken up dead, but was restored to life by the Apostle, Acts xx. 10.

EZBAI, father of Naasai, an officer in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 37.

EZBON, son of Bela, and grandson of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 7.

EZEKIEL, father of Shecaniah, Ezra viii. 5.

EZER, son of Hur, apparently the same as Ezra, 1 Chron. iv. 4, 17.

EZER, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. xii. 9.

EZER, a son of Joshua, Neh. iii. 19.

EZER, a son of Seir, Gen. xxxvi. 21, 30.

EZRI, overseer of the gardens, 1 Chron. xxvii. 26.

FELIX, the surname of Claudius, a governor of Judea. Festus Portius succeeded Felix in the government of Judea.

FORTUNATUS, came from Corinth to Ephesus to visit St Paul, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 17.

G

GAAL, son of Ebed, entered Shechem to oppose Abimelesh, son of Gideon, and was defeated, Judges ix. 26.

GABBAL, a Benjamite, Neh. xi. 8.

GAD, son of Jacob and Zilpah, and progenitor of the Gadites, Gen. xxx. 9, 10, 11.

GAD, a prophet and a friend of David, who followed him when persecuted by Saul, and wrote a history of his life, 2 Sam. xxii. 5; xxiv. 11.

GADDI, son of Susi, of the tribe of Manasseh, sent by Moses to explore the Promised Land, Numb. xiii. 11.

GADDIEL, son of Sodi, of Zebulun, sent by Moses to explore Canaan, Numb. xiii. 10.

GADI, father of Menahem, 2 Kings xv. 14.

GAHAM, son of Nahor and Reumah, Gen. xxii. 24.

GAHAR, a Levite, who returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 47.

GAIUS, a disciple of St Paul, Acts xix. 29.

GALAL, a Levite, 1 Chron. ix. 15.

GALLIO, brother of Seneca the philosopher, was proconsul of Achaia, Acts xviii. 12, 13.

GAMALIEL, son of Pedahzur, prince of Manasseh when the Israelites left Egypt, Numb. i. 10; ii. 20; vii. 64.

GAMALIEL, a celebrated Pharisee and doctor of the Law, was St Paul's preceptor, and also, according to some, the preceptor of St Stephen and St Barnabas, Acts v. 34.

GAMUL, head of one of the sacerdotal families who served in the Temple, 1 Chron. xxiv. 17.

GAREB, one of David's officers, 2 Sam. xxiii. 38.

GARMI, of Maachathi, son of Naham, 1 Chron. iv. 19.

GATAM, son of Elephaz, and grandson of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 11.

GAZABAR, a Persian, father of Mithredath, Ezra i. 8.

GAZER, third son of Caleb by Ephah, 1 Chron. ii. 40.

GAZZAM, a person whose descendants returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 48.

GEBER, son of Uri, governor of Gilead in the reign of Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 19.

GEDALIAH, son of Amariah, and grandfather of the Prophet Zephaniah, Zeph. i. 1.

GEDALIAH, a Levite, son of Ethan, or Jeduthun, 1 Chron. xxv. 3.

GEDALIAH, son of Pashur, Jer. xxxviii. 1.

GEDOR, son of Penuel, of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 18.

GEDOR, son of Maachah, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 31.

GEMALLI, father of Ammiel, of the tribe of Dan, Numb. xiii. 12.

GEMARIAH, son of Hilkiah, sent to Babylon by Zedekiah with the tribute money, and carried a letter from Jeremiah to the Jewish captives, Jer. xxix. 3, 4.

GEMARIAH, son of Shaphan, was a counsellor of King Jehoiakim, to whom he reported the prophecies of Jeremiah read by Baruch, Jer. xxxvi. 12.

GENUBATH, son of Hadad, 1 Kings xi. 20.

GERA, father of Ehud, Judges iii. 15.

GERA, of the tribe of Benjamin and family of Saul, was the father of Shimei, 2 Sam. xvi. 5.

GERSHOM, **GERSAN**, or **GERSAM**, son of Moses and Zipporah, Exod. ii. 22.

GERSHON, son of Levi, and under Moses prince of a great family of Levites, consisting of 7500 men, whose office during the marches of the Israelites in the Wilderness was to carry the veils and curtains of the tabernacle, and whose

place in the camp was west of the tabernacle, Numb. iii. 21, &c.

GESHAM, son of Jahdai, 1 Chron. ii. 47.

GESIER, third son of Aram, son of Shem, Gen. x. 23.

GIBBAR, a person whose ninety-five descendants returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 20.

GIDDALTI, son of Heman the Levite, whose family was the twelfth serving in the Temple, 1 Chron. xxv. 4.

GIDDEL, a person whose descendants returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 47, 56; Neh. vii. 49, 58.

GILEAD, son of Machir, and grandson of Manasseh, who gave his name to the district so called, Numb. xxvi. 30, 31.

GINATH, father of Tibni, 1 Kings xvi. 21.

GINNETHO, a priest who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel, Neh. xii. 4.

GOMER, son of Japheth, Gen. x. 2.

H

HAAHASHTARI, son of Ashur and Naarah, 1 Chron. iv. 6.

HABAHIAH, a priest whose descendants returned from Babylon, Neh. vii. 63.

HABAZINIAH, father of Jeremiah, Jer. xxxv. 3.

HACHALIAH, father of Nehemiah, Neh. i. 1.

HACHMONI, father of Jashobeam, 2 Sam. xxiii. 8; 1 Chron. xi. 11.

HADAD, a common name of the kings of Syria.

HADAD, son of Bedan, succeeded Husham as king of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 35. He obtained a victory over the Midianites in Moab.

IIADAD, king of Syria, reigned at Damascus when David attacked Hadad-ezer, another king of Syria, 2 Sam. viii. 2.

HADAD, son of the king of East Edom, was carried into captivity in childhood by his father's servants when Joab extirpated the males of Edom. He excited revolts against Solomon, 1 Kings xi. 17.

HADAD, son of Baal-hanan, king of Edom, reigned in Pai. He was succeeded by a dynasty called dukes, enumerated 1 Chron. i. 51, &c.

HADAD, or **HADAR**, a son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 15; 1 Chron. i. 30.

HADADEZER, king of Zobah, 2 Sam. viii. 3.

HADAN, a person whose children re-

turned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 15; Neh. vii. 20.

HADASSAH, the Hebrew name of Queen Esther, Esther ii. 7.

HADLAI, father of Amasa of Ephraim, 2 Chron. xxviii. 12.

HADORAM, the same as **ADOBAM**.

HADORAM, son of Joktan, Gen. x. 27.

HAGABAH, one of the Nethinim, born in Babylon, Ezra ii. 46; Neh. vii. 48.

HAGGERI, father of Mibhar, one of David's valiant men, 1 Chron. xi. 38.

HAGGI, second son of Gad, Gen. xli. 16.

HAGGI, of the tribe of Gad, head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 15.

HAGGIAH, son of Shimei, a descendant of Merari, 1 Chron. vi. 30.

HAGGITH, David's fifth wife, mother of Adonijah, 2 Sam. iii. 4.

HAKKATAN, or **ECCETAN**, father of Johanan, brought one hundred and ten persons from Babylon, Ezra viii. 12.

HAKUPHA, a Nethinim, Ezra ii. 51.

HALOHESH, father of Shallum, Neh. iii. 12. There is another of this name, Neh. x. 24.

HAMMEDATHA, a Persian name, father of Haman, Esther iii. 1.

HAMOR, prince of Shechem, Gen. xxxiv.

HAMUEL, father of Mishna, 1 Chron. iv. 26.

HAMUL, son of Pharez, chief of a family, Gen. xlii. 12; Numb. xxvi. 21.

HAMUTAL, daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, was the wife of King Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah, kings of Judah, 2 Kings xxiii. 31.

HANAMEEL, son of Shallum, a kinsman of Jeremiah, who sold a field at Anathoth to the Prophet, Jer. xxxii. 7, &c.

HANAN, father of Rinnah, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

HANAN, son of Azel, 1 Chron. viii. 38.

HANANEEL, an Israelite who gave name to one of the towers of Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 1; Jer. xxx. 38; Zach. xiv. 10.

HANANI, father of the Prophet Jehu, 1 Kings xvi. 7.

HANANI, a Prophet who intimated to Asa, king of Judah—"Because thou hast put thy trust in the king of Syria, and not in the Lord, the army of the king of Syria is escaped out of thine hands," 2 Chron. xvi. 7. Asa ordered him to be seized and imprisoned. Some suppose this Hanani to be the father of the Prophet Jehu, but this is not clear from the statement of the inspired historian. Jehu prophesied in the kingdom of Israel, and Hanani in that of Judah.

HANANI, a Levite, and musician in the Temple service, 1 Chron. xxv. 4, 25.

HANANIAH, one of Uzziah's captains, 2 Chron. xxvi. 11.

HANANIAH, known by his Babylonian name of Shadrach, celebrated in sacred history for his refusal to worship the golden image set up by Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. i. 11; iii. 4.

HANANIAH, son of Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 19.

HANANIAH, son of Azur, was a false prophet of Gibeon in the reign of Zedekiah. He is particularly mentioned by Jeremiah (xxxviii. 1).

HANIEL, prince of Manasseh, Numb. xxxiv. 23.

HANIEL, son of Ulla, 1 Chron. vii. 39.

HANNAH, wife of Elkanah of the tribe of Levi, and mother of Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 2.

HANNOCH, son of Midian, Gen. xxv. 4; 1 Chron. i. 33.

HANNOCH, son of Reuben, Gen. xlii. 9; Numb. xxvi. 5.

HANUN, son of Nahash, king of the Ammonites, famous for the insult offered to David's ambassadors sent to compliment him after his father's death, 2 Sam. x.; 1 Chron. xix.

HANUN, son of Seleph, assisted to build the Valley Gate of Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 3.

HARAN, eldest son of Terah, was the brother of Abraham and Nahor, and father of Lot, Milcah, and Iscah. According to the Rabbins, he was accused by his father Terah for refusing to adore fire as a deity, and was condemned to be cast into a burning furnace, where he was consumed in the presence of Terah.

HARAN, son of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 46.

HARBONAH, a Persian name of the eunuch appointed by Ahasuerus to see Haman executed, Esther i. 10; vii. 9.

HARHAHIAH, father of Uzziel, Neh. iii. 8.

HARHUR, one of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 51.

HARIPH, one whose descendants returned from the Captivity, in number one hundred and twelve, Neh. vii. 24.

HARNEPHER, second son of Zophah, 1 Chron. vii. 36.

HARSHA, head of a family, Ezra ii. 52.

HARUM, the third of the twenty-four sacerdotal families, ten hundred and seventeen of whose descendants returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 39; x. 21.

HARUM, son of Cos, and father of Aharhel, 1 Chron. iv. 8.

HARUMAPH, father of Jedaiah, Neh. iii. 10.

HARUN, a person whose descendants, in number three hundred and twenty, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 32.

HARUZ, father of Meshullemeth, wife of Manasseh, 2 Kings xxi. 19.

HASADIAH, son of Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 20.

HASENUAH, a Benjamite, 1 ix. 7.

HASHABIAH, son of Hasamiah the Levite, 1 Chron. vi. 45.

HASHABIAH, a Levite, son of Jeduthun. His descendants had the twelfth place among the Levites in the Temple, 1 Chron. xxv. 3, 14.

HASHABIAH, master of half a street at Keilah, contributed towards rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 17.

HASHABNIAH, father of Hattush, Neh. iii. 10.

HASHBADANA, a Levite, Neh. viii. 4.

HASHEM, also called **JASHEN**, an influential citizen of Jerusalem, 2 Sam. xxiii. 32; 1 Chron. xi. 34.

HASHUB, a person who contributed towards rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, and who repaired the tower of the furnaces, assisted by Malchijah, Neh. iii. 11.

HASHUBAH, son of Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 20.

HASHUM, a person whose descendants returned from Babylon, in number two hundred and twenty-three, according to Ezra (ii. 19), and three hundred and twenty-eight according to Nehemiah (vii. 22).

HASRAH, keeper of the wardrobe to King Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22.

HASSENAAH, a person whose sons made the Fish Gate at Jerusalem, after the return from Babylon, Neh. iii. 3.

HASSHUB, a Levite, 1 Chron. ix. 14.

HASUPHA, his descendants returned from Babylon.

HATACH, the Persian chamberlain of Queen Esther, Esther iv. 9.

HATHATH, son of Othniel, 1 Chron. iv. 13.

HATIPHA, one of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 54.

HATITA, one of the porters, whose descendants returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 42.

HATTIL, one whose children returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 57.

HATTUSH, son of Shecaniah, of David's family, 1 Chron. iii. 22; Ezra iii. 2.

HAVILAH, son of Cush, Gen. x. 7.

HAVILAH, son of Joktan, Gen. x. 29.

HAZAAIAH, son of Adaiah, of Judah, Neh. xi. 5.

HAZAR-MAVETH, third son of Joktan.

HAZELELPONI, daughter of the lord of Etam, 1 Chron. iv. 3.

HAZIEL, son of Shimei, a singer of the Levites, 1 Chron. xxiii. 9.

HAZOR, son of Nahor, Gen. xxii. 22.

HEBER, or **EBER**, son of Salah, and ancestor of Abraham.

HEBER, the Kenite, of Jethro's family, was the husband of Jael who killed Sisera, Judges iv. 17.

HEBRON, son of Kohath, chief of a family, Exod. vi. 8.

HEGAI, a Persian name, Queen Esther's eunuch, Esther ii. 8.

HELAH, wife of Ashur, 1 Chron. iv. 5, 7.

HELDAI, a person who was ordered by the Prophet Zechariah at the command of God to make crowns for Joshua, son of Josedech, &c. Zech. vi. 10, 11.

HELDAI, one of the twelve captains appointed by David to do duty at the palace, and who waited in the twelfth month, 1 Chron. xxvii. 15.

HELEK, son of Gilead, of Manasseh, chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 30.

HELEM, an Asherite, 1 Chron. vii. 35.

HELEZ, a valiant man of David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 26, called Helez the Paltite, and in another passage Helez the Pelonite, 1 Chron. xi. 27.

HELON, father of Eliab, of Zebulun, Numb. i. 9.

HEMAN, or **EMAN**, the Ezrahite, 1 Kings iv. 31.

HEMDAN, son of Dishon, was a descendant of Seir the Horite, Gen. xxxvi. 26.

HEN, son of Zephaniah, in whose name Zechariah said that a crown should be consecrated to the Lord, Zech. vi. 11.

HENADAD, ruler of the half part of Keilah, Neh. iii. 18.

HEPHER, son of Asher, 1 Chron. iv. 6.

HEPHER, father of Zelophehad, head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 23; xxvii. 1.

HEPHZIBAH, the mother of Manasseh, king of Judah, 2 Kings xxi. 1.

HERMAS, mentioned by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 14.

HERMOGENES, a Christian convert, 2 Tim. i. 15.

HESRAI, of Carmel in Judah, one of David's officers, 2 Sam. xxiii. 35.

HESRON, or **HEZLON**, third son of Reuben, and head of a family, Gen. xlv. 9; 1 Chron. ii. 5.

HESRON, son of Pharez, and grandson of Judah, Gen. xlv. 12; 1 Chron. ii. 5.

HETH, father of the Hittites, was the eldest son of Canaan.

HEZEKI, a Benjamite, 1 Chron. viii. 17.

HEZEKIAH, second son of Neariah, descendant of Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 23.

HEZEKIAH, son of Shallum, opposed the Israelites who carried a great number of their brethren of Judah into captivity, and compelled them to set them at liberty, 2 Chron. xxviii. 12.

HEZEKIAH, returned from Babylon with ninety-eight of his family, Neh. vii. 21.

HEZION, grandfather of Benhadad, 1 Kings xv. 18.

HEZIR, head of the seventeenth sacerdotal family, 1 Chron. xxiv. 15.

HEZRA, the same as **HESRAI**.

HIEL, of Bethel, rebuilt Jericho, and experienced the effects of Joshua's curse against any person who should attempt it, by losing his eldest son Abiram while laying the foundations, and his youngest son Segub when erecting the gates.

HILKIAH, father of Eliakim, 2 Kings xviii. 18.

HILKIAH, son of Amaziah, a Levite of Merari's family, 1 Chron. vi. 45.

HILKIAH, whom some think was the high priest in the reign of Josiah, father of the Prophet Jeremiah, Jer. i. 1.

HILKIAH, the high priest, grandson of Shallum, and father of Azariah. In his Pontificate the Book of the Law was

found in the treasury of the Temple, 2 Kings xxii. xxiii.; 2 Chron. xxiv.

HILKIAH, father of the preceding, 2 Kings xviii. 18, 26, 27.

HIRAH, a Canaanite of Adullam, whom Judah visited, Gen. xxxviii. 1, 2.

HIRAM, son of a Tyrian father and of a Hebrew woman of the tribe either of Naphtali or of Dan, was an excellent artificer in brass and copper. He made the columns called Jachin and Boaz, the brazen sea, the smaller brazen basins for the priests, &c.

HOBAB, son of Jethro, and brother-in-law of Moses, was according to some the ancestor of the Kenites who dwelt south of Judah, Numb. x. 29; Judges i. 16; 1 Sam. xv. 6.

HOD, son of Zophah, 1 Chron. vii. 37.

HODAIAH, son of Elioenai, 1 Chron. iii. 24.

HODAVIAH, of the tribe of Manasseh, distinguished for his valour, 1 Chron. v. 24.

HODAVIAH, a Levite, father of Daniel, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 40.

HODESH, wife of Shaharaim, 1 Chron. viii. 9, had seven sons heads of families.

HOGLAH, daughter of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh, Numb. xxvi. 33.

HOHAM, king of Hebron, one of the five kings who besieged Gibeon with Adonizedeck, hanged by Joshua's orders.

HONAM, son of Lotan, 1 Chron. i. 39, called Hemam, Gen. xxxvi. 22.

HOPHNI, one of the sons of Eli, wicked and dissolute, 1 Sam. ii. 12.

HORAM, king of Gezer, assisted the king of Lachish, and was defeated, Josh. x. 33.

HORAI, son of Lotan, of the race of Seir, Gen. xxxvi. 22.

HOSEA, the first name of Joshua, the son of Nun.

HOSHAIAH, father of Jezaniah, a principal citizen of Jerusalem, Neh. xii. 32.

HOSHAMA, son of Jeconiah, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

HOTHAM, son of Heber, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 32.

HOTHER, son of Heman, head of the twenty-first family of the Levites, 1 Chron. xxv. 4, 28.

HUL, or **CHUL**, son of Aram, Gen. x. 23.

HULDAH, a prophetess, wife of Shalum, was consulted by Josiah respecting the Book of the Law found in the treasury of the Temple, 2 Kings xxii. 14; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22.

HUPHAH, a priest, whose family was the thirteenth class appointed by David, 1 Chron. xxiv. 13.

HUPHAM, or **HUPPIM**, son of Benjamin, was head of a family, Gen. xlv. 21; Numb. xxvi. 39.

HUPHAM, a son of Ir, 1 Chron. vii. 12, 15.

HUR, son of Caleb, the son of Esron, was according to Josephus the husband of Miriam, Exod. xvii. 10.

HUR, a prince of Midian, killed in an encounter between Phinehas and the Midianites, Numb. xxxi. 8.

HURAI, a hero belonging to David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 32.

HURAM, son of Ehud, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 5.

HURHAH, son of Ezer, 1 Chron. iv. 4.

HURI, son of Jasoah, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. v. 14, was the father of Abihail, not of Abigail, with whom some have confounded her.

HUSHAI, the Archite, David's friend, 2 Sam. xv. 32, &c.

HUSHAM, king of Edom, successor to Jobab, Gen. xxxvii. 34.

HUSHIM, son of Dan, Gen. xlv. 23.

HUSHIM, father of Abitub and Elpaal, 1 Chron. viii. 11.

HUZZAB, a queen of the Assyrians worshipped as a deity, Nah. ii. 7.

HYMENÆUS, a person excommunicated by St Paul.

I

IBHAR, a son of David, 2 Sam. v. 15.

IBNEIAH, son of Jeroham, 1 Chron. ix. 8.

IBNIJAH, father of Reuel, 1 Chron. ix. 8.

IBRI, son of Merari, a Levite, 1 Chron. xxiv. 27.

IBZAM, son of Tola, 1 Chron. vii. 2.

ICHABOD, son of Phinehas, and grandson of Eli the high priest, was born at the moment when his mother heard the fatal tidings that the ark was taken, 1 Sam. iv. 19-21.

IDDO, chief of the Nethinim in captivity in Casiphia, Ezra viii. 17.

IDDO, chief of the half-tribe of Manasseh beyond the Jordan, 1 Chron. xxvii. 21.

IDDO, son of Joah, 1 Chron. vi. 21.

IDDO, a prophet of Judah, who wrote the history of the kings Rehoboam and

Abijah. He entitled his work *Midrash*, or *Inquiries*, 2 Chron. xiii. 22. Probably he also wrote prophecies against Jeroboam the son of Nebat. Josephus and others are of opinion that Iddo was sent to Jeroboam at Bethel, and that he was the "man of God" killed by a lion, 1 Kings xiii.

IDDO, son of Abinadab, governor of Mahanaim, 1 Kings iv. 14.

IGAL, of the tribe of Issachar, one of those appointed to view the Promised Land.

IGDALIAH, a person into whose apartment Jeremiah carried the Rechabites to offer them wine, Jer. xxxv. 4.

IGEAL, son of Shemaiah, 1 Chron. iii. 22.

IKKESH, an officer in David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 26.

IMNA, son of Helem, 1 Chron. vii. 35.

ILAI, a valiant man in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 32.

IMLAI, father of Macaiab, 1 Kings xxii. 8.

IMMER, head of a family of priests, the sixteenth in the Temple service, 1 Chron. ix. 12; xxiv. 14. His descendants, 1052 in number, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 37.

IMRAH, son of Zephah, 1 Chron. vii. 36.

IMRI, son of Omri, 1 Chron. ix. 4.

IMRI, father of Zaccur, Neh. iii. 2.

IPHEDEIAH, son of Shashak, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 25.

IRA, son of Jair, 2 Sam. xx. 26.

IRA, son of Ikkesh, was an officer in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 28.

IRA, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 12.

IRAD, son of Enoch, and grandson of Cain, Gen. iv. 18.

IRAM, the last duke of Edom of Esau's family, Gen. xxxvi. 43.

IRI, a valiant warrior, son of Bela, 1 Chron. vii. 7.

IRIJAH, a person who arrested the Prophet Jeremiah as he was proceeding to Anathoth, Jer. xxxvii. 13, &c.

IRU, son of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 15.

ISCAH, supposed by some to be the same as Sarah, the wife of Abraham.

ISHBAH, son of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 17.

ISHBAK, fifth son of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2.

ISHBI-BEN-OB, which means Ishbi, the son of Ob, was one of the Rephaim, or giants. His name means the *son of swelling*, or *mountain of a man*. The iron of his spear, or rather the spear itself, as the Hebrew implies, weighed three hundred shekels, or one hundred and fifty ounces. This giant was on the point of killing David, when he was himself killed by Abishai, son of Zeruiah, 2 Sam. xxi. 16, 17.

ISHI, son of Appaim, 1 Chron. ii. 31.

ISHMA, son of Etam, 1 Chron. iv. 3.

ISHMACHIAH, probably a priest, or Levite, in the time of Hezekiah, to

whom that king entrusted the care of the first-fruits and offerings brought to the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxi. 13.

ISHMAEL, son of Nethaniah, of the royal family of Judah, treacherously killed Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar had established over the remnant of the people in Judea after the destruction of Jerusalem. He was obliged to flee to Baalis, king of the Ammonites, Jer. xli.

ISHMAIAH, son of Obadiah, chief of Zebulun, 1 Chron. xxvii. 19.

ISHMAIAH, of Benjamin, a valiant man who joined David, 1 Chron. xii. 4.

ISHMERAI, son of Elpaal, 1 Chron. viii. 18.

ISHPAN, a Benjamite, 1 Chron. viii. 22.

ISHUAH, or **JESHUAH**, second son of Asher, Gen. xli. 17.

ISHUI, son of Saul, 1 Sam. xiv. 49.

ISPAH, son of Beriah, 1 Chron. viii. 16.

ISRAEL, a name given to the Patriarch Jacob.

ISSACHAR, fifth son of Jacob and Leah, was progenitor of the tribe of Issachar, Gen. xxx. 14-18.

ITHAMAR, the fourth son of Aaron. He and his descendants continued common priests till the high priesthood came into his family in the person of Eli.

ITHIEL, son of Isaiah, of the tribe of Benjamin, Neh. xi. 7.

ITHMAH, an officer in David's army, 1 Chron. vi. 46.

ITHREAM, son of David and Eglah, 1 Chron. iii. 3.

ITTAI, son of Ribai, surnamed the Gittite, a native of Gibeah, 2 Sam. xv. 19, 20; 1 Chron. xi. 31.

IZHAR, or **IZEHAR**, son of Kohath, and father of Korah, Numb. iii. 19-27; Exod. vi. 18-22; 1 Chron. vi. 18.

IZHARI, son of Shelometh, 1 Chron. xxiv. 22.

IZRAHIAH, son of Nabab, 1 Chron. vii. 3.

IZRI, head of the fourth class of the twenty-four sacerdotal families, 1 Chron. xxv. 11.

JAAKOBAB, a distinguished person of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

JAALA, a Nethinim, Neh. vii. 58.

JAALAM, son of Esau and Aholibamah, Gen. xxxvi. 5.

JAANAI, a chief of the tribe of Gad who dwelt in Jerusalem, 1 Chron. v. 12.

JAARESHIAH, a Benjamite, 1 Chron. viii. 27.

JAASAU, a Hebrew who returned from the Captivity and divorced his idolatrous wife, Ezra x. 37.

JAAZANIAH, son of a Maachathite, 2 Kings xxv. 23, compared with Jer. xl. 8; xlii. 1.

JAAZANIAH, son of Jeremiah the Rechabite, Jer. xxxv. 3.

JAAZANIAH, son of Shaphan, Ezek. xiii. 11.

JAAZANIAH, son of Azur, Ezek. vi. 1.

JAAZIAH, son of Merari the Levite, 1 Chron. xxiv. 26.

JAAZIEL, a Levite musician, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

JABAL, son of Iamech and Adah, father of those who lodge under tents, and of shepherds, Gen. iv. 30.

JABESH, father of Shallum, the fifteenth king of the Ten Tribes, 2 Kings xv. 10.

JABEZ, a person whose piety is commended, probably the son of Cos, or of Kenaz, 1 Chron. iv. 9, 10.

JABIN, king of Hazor, in the northern region of Canaan, defeated and killed by Joshua, Josh. xi. 1, &c.

JABIN, king of Hazor, an oppressor of the Israelites, and whose general Sisera was defeated by Barak at the foot of Mount Tabor, Judges iv. 2.

JACHAN, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. v. 13.

JACHIN, fifth son of Simeon, and head of a family, Gen. xvi. 10; Numb. xxvi. 12.

JACHIN, head of the twenty-first family of priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 17.

JACOB, father of Matthan, and grandfather of Joseph, Matt. i. 15.

JADA, son of Onam, and father of Jether and Jonathan, 1 Chron. ii. 28, 32.

JADAU, son of Nebo, Ezra x. 43.

JAHATH, a Levite of Gershom's family, son of Libui, 1 Chron. vi. 20.

JAHATH, a Levite of Merari's family, surveyor of the workmen employed by Josiah to repair the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12.

JAHAZIAH, an inhabitant or a son of Tikvah, Ezra x. 15.

JAHAZIEL, one of the priests who accompanied the ark to Mount Zion, 1 Chron. xvi. 6.

JAHAZIEL, a brave man who joined David, 1 Chron. xii. 4.

JAHAZIEL, son of Hebron, 1 Chron. xxiii. 19.

JAHDAI, probably the son of Ephah, 1 Chron. ii. 47.

JAHDIEL, head of a family, of the tribe of Manasseh, 1 Chron. v. 24.

JAHDO, son of Buz, 1 Chron. v. 14.

JAHLEEL, third son of Zebulun, head of a family, Gen. xvi. 14; Numb. xxvi. 26.

JAHMAI, son of Tola, and grandson of Issachar, 1 Chron. vii. 2.

JAHZEEL, of Naphtali, head of a family, Gen. xvi. 24; Numb. xxvi. 48.

JAHZERAH, son of Meshullam, and father of Adiel, 1 Chron. ix. 12.

JAIR, of Manasseh, succeeded Tola in the government of Israel, Judges x. 3.

JAIR, son of Shimei, was father of Mordecai, Esther ii. 5.

JAIRUS, chief of the synagogue at Capernaum, whose daughter was recovered from a dangerous illness by our blessed Saviour, Mark v. 22.

JALON, son of Ezra, 1 Chron. iv. 17.

JAMIN, second son of Simeon, was

head of a family, Gen. xlv. 10; Numb. xxvi. 12.

JAMLECH, head of the Simeonites, 1 Chron. iv. 34.

JANIA, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. v. 12.

JANNA, son of Joseph, and father of Melchi, Luke iii. 24.

JAPHETH, the eldest son of Noah, and known in profane history under the name of Japetus.

JAPHIA, king of Lachish, killed by Joshua, Josh. x. 3.

JAPHIA, a son of David, 2 Sam. v. 15.

JAPHLET, son of Heber, descended from Achor, 1 Chron. vii. 32.

JARAH, son of Ahaz, of Saul's family, 1 Chron. ix. 42, called Jehoadad, 1 Chron. viii. 36.

JAREB, king of Assyria, by whom the Ten Tribes were carried captive, Hos. v. 13; x. 16, supposed to indicate either Tiglath-pileser or Shalmanezar.

JARED, son of Mehalaleel, and father of Enoch, was an Antediluvian Patriarch, Gen. v. 18, 19.

JARESIAH, a Benjamite, 1 Chron. viii. 27.

JARHÁ was an Egyptian, Sheshan's slave, who married his master's daughter, and was the father of Attai, 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35.

JARIB, son of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 24.

JARIB, one of the elders who joined Ezra at the river Abava, Ezra viii. 16.

JAROA, son of Gilead, 1 Chron. v. 14.

JASHEN, the Gizonite, called Hahshem, 2 Sam. xxiii. 32, was the father of some valiant men in the reign of David, 1 Chron. xi. 34.

JASHOBEAM, son of Zabdiel, 2 Sam. xxiii. 8.

JASHOBEAM, the son of Hachmoni, 1 Chron. xi. 16.

JASHOBEAM, the Korhite, a follower of David, 1 Chron. xii. 6.

JASHUB, of Issachar, chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 24.

JASHUB, or **SHEAR-JASHUB**, son of Issaiah, Isa. vii. 3.

JASON, St Paul's host at Thessalonica, who hazarded his life to preserve the Apostle during a tumult in that city, Rom. xvi. 21; Acts xvii. 7. He was related to St Paul, and the Greeks allege he was bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia.

JATHNIEL, son of Meshelemiah, 1 Chron. xxvi. 2.

JAZEZ, a Hagarite, who had the principal charge of David's flocks, 1 Chron. xxvii. 31.

JEBERECHIAH, father of Zechariah, Isa. viii. 2.

JEBUS, son of Canaan, was father of the Jebusites who dwelt in Jerusalem and the surrounding country, Josh. xv. 63; 2 Sam. v. 6, &c.

JECAMIAH, son of Jeconiah, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

JECOLIAH, mother of Amaziah, king of Judah, 2 Kings xv. 2.

JECONIAH, son of Jehoiakim, 1 Chron. iii. 16.

JEDAIAH, a priest, 1 Chron. ix. 10.

JEDAIAH, son of Harumaph, of the family of the priests, Neh. iii. 10.

JEDAIAH, a priest who returned from Babylon with seven hundred and ninety-three of his brethren, Ezra ii. 36.

JEDAIAH, one who signed the covenant, Ezra x. 43.

JEDAIAH, head of the second class of priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 7.

JEDAIAH, son of Shimri, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 37.

JEDEIAH, a Levite, son of Shebael, 1 Chron. xxiv. 20.

JEDIAEL, of Manasseh, abandoned Saul's party, and joined David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xi. 45; xii. 20.

JEDIAH, a Meronothite, had the care of David's flocks, 1 Chron. xxvii. 30.

JEDIDAH, daughter of Adaiah of Boscath, was mother of King Josiah, 2 Kings xxii. 1.

JEDIDIAH, a name given by David to his son Solomon.

JEDUTHUN, or **ETHAN**, a Levite of Merari's family, was one of the four great masters of music belonging to the Temple, 1 Chron. xvi. 41.

JEEZER, son of Gilead, chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 30.

JEHALELEEL, son of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 16; 2 Chron. xxix. 12.

JEHAZIEL, one of the heroes who joined David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xii. 4.

JEHEZEKEL, the twentieth in rank of the twenty-four families of priests appointed for the Temple service, 1 Chron. xxiv. 16.

JEHIAH, a Levite who assisted in removing the ark from the house of Obbededom, 1 Chron. xv. 24.

JEHIEL, a Levite of Gibeon, 1 Chron. ix. 35.

JEHIEL, one of the overseers in the store-room of the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxi. 13.

JEHOADAH, or **JABAH**, son of Ahaz, 1 Chron. viii. 36; ix. 42.

JEHOADDAN, mother of Amariah, 2 Kings xiv. 2.

JEHOASH, son of Ahaziah, 2 Kings xi. 21.

JEHOHANAN, a porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 3.

JEHOIADA, father of Benaiah, 2 Sam. viii. 18.

JEHOIADA, son of Benaiah, 1 Chron. xxvii. 34.

JEHOIADA, a priest, 2 Kings xi. 4.

JEHOIADA, leader of the Aaronites, 1 Chron. xii. 27.

JEHOIADA, called **Joadus** by Josephus, succeeded Azariah in the high priesthood, and, with his wife Jehoshabeath, rescued Joash, son of Joram, king of Judah, from the murderous violence of Athaliah, and concealed the infant prince, only a year old, in the Temple. He died in the one hundred and thirtieth year of his age, and was buried in the sepulchre of the kings at Jerusalem, a distinction due to the eminent services he had rendered to the royal family and the state.

JEHOIARIB, head of the first family of priests established by David, 1 Chron. xxiv. 7. From whom descended the illustrious family of the Maccabees.

JEHOSADAK, son of Seraiah, 1 Chron. vi. 14.

JEHOSHAPHAT, son of Ahilud, was secretary to David and Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 3.

JEHOSHAPHAT, son of Paruah, was Solomon's governor of Issachar, 1 Kings iv. 17.

JEHOZABAD, son of Shomer, was one of the murderers of King Joash, 2 Kings xii. 21.

JEHOZABAD, son of Obbededom, a Levite, and a porter of the tabernacle, 1 Chron. xxvi. 4.

JEHOZABAD, general of King Jehoshaphat's army, 2 Chron. xvii. 18.

JEHOZADAK, son of Seraiah the high priest, died at Babylon, 1 Chron. vi. 14, 15; Ezra iii. 2; x. 18.

JEHU, son of Hanani, 1 Kings xvi. 1, 4.

JEHU, son of Obed, 1 Chron. ii. 38.

JEHUBBAH, son of Shamer, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 34.

JEHUCAL, son of Shelemiah, Jer. xxxvii. 3.

JEHUDI, son of Nethaniah, Jer. xxxvi. 14.

JEHUDIJAH, wife of Ezra, 1 Chron. iv. 18.

JEHUSH, the second son of Eshek, a descendant of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 39.

JEIEL, scribe to Uzziel, 2 Chron. xxvi. 11.

JEIEL, a Levite of Gibeon, 1 Chron. ix. 35.

JEIEL, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 7.

JEIEL, a Levite and singer in the Temple, 1 Chron. xv. 21.

JEKAMEAM, fourth son of Hebron, 1 Chron. xxiii. 19.

JEKAMIAH, son of Shallum, of Caleb's family, 1 Chron. ii. 41.

JEKUTHIEL, son of Ezra, 1 Chron. iv. 18.

JEMIMA, one of the Patriarch Job's daughters, Job xlii. 14.

JEPHUNNEH, father of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, Numb. xiii. 6.

JEPHUNNEH, son of Jether, 1 Chron. vii. 38.

JERAH, fourth son of Joktan, Gen. x. 26.

JERAHMEEL, son of Kiah, 1 Chron. xxiv. 29.

JERAHMEEL, eldest son of Hezron, of the tribe of Judah, and brother of Chelubai of Ram, 1 Chron. ii. 9, 25, 27.

JERAHMEEL, commanded by King Jehoiakim to seize Baruch and Jeremiah, Jer. xxxvi. 26.

JERED, the son of Ezra, and father of Gedor, 1 Chron. iv. 18.

JEREMAI, son of Hashum, Ezra x. 33.

JEREMIAH, of Libnah, father of Hamutal, wife of King Josiah, 2 Kings xxiv. 18.

JEREMIAH, a very valiant man of the tribe of Manasseh, head of a family, 1 Chron. v. 24.

JEREMIAH, the name of two warriors in David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 4, 10, 13.

JEREMOTH, son of Elam, divorced his wife when he returned from Babylon, Ezra x. 26. Also the name of a son of Zattu, who acted in a similar manner, Ezra x. 27.

JERIAH, son of Hebron, 1 Chron. xxiii. 19.

JERIBA, one of David's officers, 1 Chron. xi. 46.

JERIEL, son of Zola, 1 Chron. vii. 2.

JERIAH, the chief of the sons of Hebron, 1 Chron. xxiii. 19; xxvi. 31.

JERIMUTH, the son of Becher, of the tribe of Benjamin, joined David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. vii. 8; xii. 5.

JERIOTH, wife of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 18.

JEROHAM, father of Elkanah, 1 Chron. vi. 27.

JEROHAM, father of Ibneiah, 1 Chron. ix. 8.

JERUBBAAL, a surname of Gideon, after he had destroyed Baal's grove.

JERUSHA, mother of Jotham, son of King Uzziah, 2 Kings xv. 33.

JESIAH, son of Pelatiah, 1 Chron. iii. 21.

JESHAIAH, son of Jeduthun, head of the eighth family of the Levites appointed for the Temple service, 1 Chron. xxv. 3.

JESHEBEAB, chief of the fourteenth family of priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 13.

JESHER, son of Caleb and Azubah, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

JESHISHAI, son of Jado, 1 Chron. v. 14.

JESHOSHAI, an eminent person of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

JESHUA, a Levite, 2 Chron. xxxi. 15. Also the name of a person who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel, Ezra ii. 2.

JESHUI, son of Saul, 1 Sam. xiv. 49.

JESIMIEL, an eminent man of the family of Shimei, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

JESSE, son of Obed, and father of David, who was his youngest son, Ruth iv. 17, 22; 1 Chron. ii. 12; Matt. i. 5.

JESUI, third son of Asher, head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 44.

JETHER, son of Gideon, had not courage to kill Zeba and Zalmunna, when commanded by his father, Judges viii. 20.

JETHER, husband of Abigail, David's sister, and father of Amasa, 1 Chron. ii. 17.

JETHETH, son of Esau, was duke of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 40.

JETUR, son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 15.

JEUEL, son of Zerah, 1 Chron. ix. 6.

JEUSH, son of Esau and Aholibamah, Gen. xxxvi. 5.

JEUSH, son of Bilhan, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

JEUSH, son of Shimei, 1 Chron. xxiii. 10.

JEUZ, son of Shaharaim, 1 Chron. viii. 10.

JEZER, son of Naphtali, head of a family, Gen. xvi. 24.

JEZER, son of Gilead, Numb. xxvi. 49.

JEZIEL, one of David's valiant men, 1 Chron. xii. 3.

JEZOAI, son of Helah, 1 Chron. iv. 7.

JEZRAHIAH, superintendent or chief of the singers belonging to the Temple, Neh. xii. 42.

JEZREEL, son of Etam, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 3.

JEZREBL, son of the Prophet Hosea, Hos. i. 4.

JIBSAM, son of Tola, 1 Chron. vii. 2.

JIDLAPH, son of Nahor, was nephew of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 22.

JIMNAH, eldest son of Asher, head of his family, Gen. xlv. 17; Numb. xxvi. 44.

JOAB, son of Seraiah, 1 Chron. iv. 14. Also one whose descendants returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 6; viii. 9; Neh. vii. 11.

JOAH, son of Zimmah, and grandson of Gershom, 1 Chron. vi. 21.

JOAH, secretary to King Josiah, employed in repairing the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8.

JOAH, son of Asaph, was sent by King Hezekiah to answer Rab-shakeh, 2 Kings xviii. 18.

JOASH, father of Gideon, Judges vi. 11.

JOASH, son of Amalek, was ordered by Ahab to imprison the Prophet Micahiah, 1 Kings xxii. 26. He is called Joash the king's son.

JOASH, a descendant of Shelah, son of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 22.

JOASH, son of Becher, 1 Chron. vii. 8.

JOASH, superintendent of the oil cellars, 1 Chron. xxvii. 28.

JOB, third son of Issachar, Gen. xlv. 13, called **JASHUB**, 1 Chron. vii. 1.

JOBAB, son of Zerah, and grandson of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 33; 1 Chron. i. 44.

JOBAB, son of Joktan, Gen. x. 29; 1 Chron. i. 33.

JOBAB, king of Madon, Josh. xi. 1.

JOBAB, son of Gera, and **JOBAB**, son of Elpaal, both of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 9, 18.

JOCHEBED, wife of Amram, and mother of Aaron, Moses, and Miriam.

JOED, a Benjamite, thought to be the same as Judah, Neh. xi. 9, and Hoda-viah, 1 Chron. ix. 7; Neh. xi. 7.

JOEL, eldest son of Samuel, 1 Sam. viii. 1.

JOEL, son of Josibiah, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 35.

JOEL, son of Izraiah, of the tribe of

Issachar, 1 Chron. vii. 3. Also the name of one of David's valiant men, 1 Chron. xi. 38.

JOEL, son of Gerahom, a Levite, was chief musician in David's time, 1 Chron. xv. 7. Also the name of a son of Pedaiiah, of the tribe of Manasseh, 1 Chron. xxvii. 20.

JOEL, son of Hanoch, the eldest son of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 4.

JOELAH, son of Jeroham, one of David's supporters, 1 Chron. xii. 7.

JOEZER, a gallant officer of David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 6.

JOGLI, father of Bukki, head of the tribe of Dan, Numb. xxxiv. 22.

JOHAH, a brave man in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 45.

JOHANAN, or **JOHN**, high priest, was the son of Azariah the high priest, and was the father of another Azariah, 1 Chron. vi. 9, 10. Some consider him to be the same as Jehoiada, the father of Zechariah, in the reign of Joash, king of Judah, 2 Chron. xxiv. 11, &c.

JOHANAN, son of Josiah, 1 Chron. iii. 15.

JOHANAN, son of Elieoenai, a descendant of David by Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 24.

JOHANAN, son of Careah, 2 Kings xxv. 23; Jer. xli. 15, 16. When informed that Ishmael was at Mizpah intending to murder Gedaliah, the governor appointed by Nebuchadnezzar, Johanan gave him intelligence of the design, and offered to put Ishmael to death. Gedaliah refused to give credit to his statement, and was massacred.

JOIADA, or **JUDAS**, high priest, succeeded Eliashib, or Joashib, who lived under Nehemiah, Neh. iii. 28.

JOIARIB, one of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel, Neh. xii. 6.

JOKIM, a descendant of Shelah, 1 Chron. iv. 22.

JOKSAN, second son of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2.

JOKTAN, eldest son of Eber, peopled the region called *Kodem* by Moses, Gen. x. 25. He is supposed to have been the ancestor of the *pure* or ancient Arabs,

before they intermarried with Ishmael's descendants.

JONADAB, son of Shimeah, was David's nephew. He is called a "subtile man," and the adviser of Amnon, son of David, in the violation of Tamar, 2 Sam. xiii. 3.

JONADAB, son of Rechab, was head of the Rechabites in the time of Jehu, king of Israel. He added to the ancient austerity of the Rechabites that of abstaining from wine, 2 Kings x. 15, 16.

JONATHAN, a Levite, son of Gershon, and grandson of Moses, resided some time in the house of Micah at Laish, Judges xvii. 10.

JONATHAN, son of Abiathar, the high priest, gave notice to Adonijah and his party, near the Fountain of Rogel, that David had declared Solomon his successor, 1 Kings i. 42, 43.

JONATHAN, son of Shage, the Hararite, was distinguished for his bravery in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 34.

JONATHAN, son of Uzziah, treasurer to King David, 1 Chron. xxvii. 25.

JONATHAN, son of Asael, named by Ezra to take cognizance of those Hebrews who had married idolatrous wives, Ezra x. 15.

JONATHAN, son of Jehoiada, and father of Jaddua, the celebrated high priest of the Jews in the time of Alexander the Great, was high priest, and lived under the administrations of Ezra and Nehemiah, Neh. xii. 10-12. Josephus calls him John, and says that he lived in the reign of Artaxerxes. He died in the thirty-third year of his pontificate, and was succeeded by his son Jaddua.

JONATHAN, a scribe, and keeper of the prisons under King Zedekiah, treated the Prophet Jeremiah with great severity, Jer. xxxvii. 14, 15, 20.

JORAH, the name of a person whose children returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 18.

JORAI, a Gadite, 1 Chron. v. 13.

JORAM, son of Toi, king of Hamath, was sent to David by his father to con-

gratulate him for his victory over Hadadezer, 2 Sam. viii. 10.

JORIM, is enumerated in the human genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 29.

JORKOAM, son of Raham, 1 Chron. ii. 44.

JOSE, one of our Saviour's human ancestors, Luke iii. 29.

JOSHABAD, one of the warriors who came to David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xii. 4.

JOSHAH, son of Amaziah, 1 Chron. iv. 34.

JOSHAIRAH, one of David's mighty men, 1 Chron. xi. 46.

JOSHBKASHAH, son of Heman, a Levite, and singer, of the seventeenth class of the Levites, 1 Chron. xxv. 4, 24.

JOSHIBIAH, son of Seraiah, 1 Chron. iv. 35.

JOSIPHIAH, a person who returned from Babylon with one hundred and sixty persons, Ezra viii. 10.

JOZABAD, one of the captains of the tribe of Manasseh who came to David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xii. 20. Also the name of one of the overseers in the store-rooms of the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxi. 13.

JOZACHAR, son of Shimeath, one of those who assassinated Joash, king of Judah, 2 Kings xii. 21.

JUBAL, son of Lamech and Adah, invented musical instruments, Gen. iv. 21.

JUCAS, son of Shelemiah, Jer. xxxviii. 1.

JUDAH, or **JEHUDAH**, the fourth son of Jacob and Leah, was born in Mesopotamia, B. C. 1755. He was the progenitor of the royal tribe which bears his name, of which the Messiah, our blessed Saviour, was the last representative. Judah was, next to Joseph, the most eminent of Jacob's sons; he was always considered the chief of the Patriarch's children; his tribe was the most numerous and powerful; and the privileges of the first-born were transferred to him after the punishment of Reuben. He married Shuah, the daughter of a Canaanite, Gen. xxvii. 26; xxxviii. 27-29.

JUDAS, or **JOIADA**, high priest of the Jews after the Babylonish Captivity, was

the son of Eliashib, and father of Jonathan, Neh. xii. 10.

JUDAS, of Gaulan, or the Gaulanite, opposed the enrolment of the people made by Cyrenius in Judea, Acts v. 37. The party who held his views were numerous.

JUDAS, St Paul's host at Damascus, Acts ix. 9, 11.

JULIUS, a centurion of the cohort of Augustus, to whom Festus committed St Paul to convey him to Rome. He had great regard for the Apostle, and permitted him to visit his friends at Sidon, Acts xxvii. 1-3, &c.

JUSHAB-HESED, son of Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. iii. 20.

K

KADMIEL, one who returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 40.

KALLAI, a person so called, Neh. xii. 20.

KEDAR, son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 13, father of the Kedarenians mentioned by Pliny.

KEDEMAH, the youngest son of Ishmael, who probably resided east of the mountains of Gilead, Gen. xxv. 15.

KELITAH, or KELAIAH, a Levite, Ezra x. 23.

KEMUEL, third son of Nahor, the father of the Syrians, or rather of Aram, Gen. xxii. 21.

KEMUEL, son of Shiphthan of Ephraim, was one of the deputies appointed to divide the Promised Land, Numb. xxxiv. 4.

KENAZ, father of Othniel and Caleb, Josh. xv. 17; Judges i. 13; iii. 9, &c.

KENAZ, fourth son of Eliphaz, son of Esau, a duke or chief of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 15.

KEROS, one of the Nethinim, Ezra xi. 14.

KEZIA, the second daughter of the Patriarch Job, born after his misfortunes, Job xliii. 14.

KIRIATH-ARIM, a person whose

descendants returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 25.

KISH, son of Ner, was father of Saul, 1 Sam. ix. 1.

KISH, son of Abi-Gabeon and Maachah, 1 Chron. viii. 30.

KISH, son of Abdi, a Levite of Merari's family, 2 Chron. xxix. 12.

KITTIM, son of Javan, and grandson of Noah, Gen. x. 4.

KOHATH, son of Levi, Gen. xlvi. 11. His family were appointed to carry the ark and the sacred vessels of the Tabernacle, while the Israelites marched through the Wilderness.

KOLAIAH, of the tribe of Benjamin, Neh. xi. 7.

KOLAIAH, the father of Ahab, Jer. xxix. 21.

KORAH, son of Izhar, Exod. vi. 21. Also the son of Esau and Aholibamah, who succeeded Kenaz in part of the dukedom of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 15, 16.

KORE, father of Shallum, 1 Chron. ix. 19; 2 Chron. xxx. 14.

KUSHAIAH, or KISHI, son of Abdi, and father of Ethan, a Levite of Merari's family, 1 Chron. xv. 17. Also a singer, who stood before the ark, 1 Chron. vi. 44.

L

LAADAH, son of Shelah, and father of Mareshah, of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 21.

LAADAN, son of Gershon, 1 Chron. xxiii. 7, 8; xxvi. 21.

LAEL, father of Eliasaph, chief of the Gershonites, Numb. iii. 24.

LAHAD, son of Jahath, a Zorathite, 1 Chron. iv. 2.

LAHMI, a brother giant of Goliath, 1 Chron. xx. 5.

LAISH, father of Phalti, 1 Sam. xxv. 44.

LAPIDOTH, the husband of the Prophetess Deborah, Judges iv. 4; but some contend that this was merely the name of her birthplace or residence.

LECAH, son of Er, 1 Chron. iv. 21.

LEHABIM, the third son of Mizraim is so called Gen. x. 13.

LEUMMIM, or **LOAMIM**, third son of Dedan, and grandson of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 3.

LIBNI, son of Gershom, Numb. iii. 18.

LOTAN, son of Seir, Gen. xxxvi. 20, 23.

LUCIUS, one of the prophets in the church in Antioch, whom some believe to have been one of the Seventy Disciples, Acts xiii. 1.

LUD, fourth son of Shem, Gen. x. 22.

LUDIM, son of Mizraim, Gen. x. 13, ancestor of a people so called.

M

MAACATI, father of Ahasbai, 2 Sam. xxiii. 34.

MAACHAH, son of Nahor and Reumah, Gen. xxii. 24.

MAACHAH, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, was wife of David, and mother of Absalom and Tamar, 2 Sam. iii. 3.

MAACHAH, daughter of Abishalom, was wife of Abijam, king of Judah, and mother of Asa his successor, by whom she was deprived of her office of priestess of the groves, 1 Kings xv. 10, 13, 14.

MAACHAH, father of Shephatiah, head of the tribe of Simeon in David's time, 1 Chron. xxvii. 16.

MAACHAH, concubine of Caleb, and mother of Sheber and Tirhanah, 1 Chron. ii. 48. Also the name of the wife of Machir, and mother of Peresh, 1 Chron. vii. 16.

MAACHAH, father of Achish, king of Gath, 1 Kings ii. 39.

MAADAI, son of Bani, dismissed his wife whom he had married contrary to the Law, Ezra x. 34.

MAADIAH, or **MOADIAH**, one of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel, Neh. xii. 5, 17.

MAAI, a musician, Neh. xii. 36.

MAASEIAH, son of Ahaz, king of Israel, was assassinated by Zichri, 2 Chron. xxviii. 7.

MAASEIAH, son of Adaiah, was one to whom the high priest Jehoiadah intimated his design of placing Joash on the throne, 2 Chron. xxiii. 2. Also the name of the grandfather of Baruch, Jer. xxxii. 12. Also a son of Adiel, 1 Chron. ix. 12; xv. 18.

MAATH, is mentioned in the genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 26.

MAAZ, son of Ram, 1 Chron. ii. 27.

MAAZIAH, chief of the twenty-fourth family of the priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 18.

MACHBANI, a valiant man in David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 13.

MACHBENAI, son of Shevah, and father of Gibeah, 1 Chron. ii. 49.

MACHI, father of Guel, of the tribe of Gad, Numb. xiii. 15.

MACHIR, son of Manasseh and grandson of Joseph, was chief of the family of the Machirites, Numb. xxvi. 29. Also the son of Ammiel, of Lodebar, with whom Mephibosheth was brought up, 2 Sam. ix. 5; xvii. 27.

MADAI, third son of Japheth, Gen. x. 2.

MADMANNAH, or **MADMENAH**, son of **Shaph**, 1 Chron. ii. 49.

MAGDIEL, prince of the Edomites, succeeded **Mitzar**, Gen. xxxvi. 43.

MAGOG, son of **Japheth**, Gen. x. 2.

MAGPIASH, one who sealed the covenant, Neh. x. 20.

MAHALA, or **MEHOLA**, son of **Rakem**, 1 Chron. vii. 18.

MAHALATH, or **BASEMATH**, daughter of **Ishmael**, was a wife of **Esau**, Gen. xxviii. 9. Also the name of a wife of **King Rehoboam**, 2 Chron. xi. 18.

MAHALALEEL, or **MALALEEL**, son of **Cainan**, of the race of **Seth**, was one of the **Antediluvian Patriarchs**, Gen. v. 15, &c. The **Orientalists** allege that he was the first who dug mines in the earth in search of metals.

MAHALI, eldest son of **Merari**, chief of a family, Exod. vi. 19; Numb. iii. 33.

MAHARAI, chief of the twenty-four thousand men who attended **David** as guards in the tenth month, 2 Sam. xxiii. 28; 1 Chron. xxvii. 13.

MAHLA, **MAALA**, or **MAHALA**, one of the daughters of **Zelophehad**, who with her sisters received their allotment in the Land of **Canaan**, because their father died without male issue, Numb. xxvi. 33; Josh. xvii. 3; 1 Chron. vii. 15.

MAHLON, son of **Elimelech** and **Naomi**, Ruth i. 2. He married **Ruth**, and died in the country of **Moab**.

MALCHAM, son of **Bela** and **Hodesh**, 1 Chron. viii. 9.

MALCHIAH, or **MELCHIAS**, chief of a sacerdotal family, 1 Chron. xxiv. 9.

MALCHIAH, a Levite, son of **Ethni**, and father of **Baneseiah**, 1 Chron. vi. 40.

MALCHIAH, father of **Pashur**, 1 Chron. ix. 12.

MALCHIAH, son of **Harim**, assisted at the building of part of a street at **Jerusalem**, Neh. iii. 11.

MALCHIAH, chief or lord of **Beth-Haccerem**, rebuilt the gate at **Jerusalem** called the *Dung Gate*, Neh. iii. 14.

MALCHIAH, another who assisted in rebuilding **Jerusalem**, Neh. iii. 31.

MALCHIAH, is mentioned Jer. xxi. 1. This Prophet also mentions **Mal-**

chiah, son of **Ham-melech**, keeper of the prisons at **Jerusalem**, by whose order he was let down into a cistern, in which, though there was no water, he was in danger of his life, and would probably have perished, if he had not been quickly delivered by **Ebed-Melech**, Jer. xxxviii. 6, &c.

MALCHIEL, son of **Beriah**, and grandson of **Asher**, was chief of the family of the **Malchielites** under **Moses**, Gen. xlii. 17; Numb. xxvi. 45.

MALCHIRAM, son of **King Jeconiah**, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

MALCHISHUA, third son of **Saul**, killed with his father and brothers in battle, 1 Sam. xxxi. 2.

MALCHUS, or **MALECHUS**, a servant of the high priest **Caiaphas**. He was among those sent to apprehend our Saviour in the Garden of **Gethsemane**, when his right ear was cut off by **St Peter**, John xviii. 10.

MALLOTHI, son of **Heman**, chief of the tenth family of the **Levites**, 1 Chron. xxv. 4, 26.

MALLUCH, a Levite of the family of **Merari**, son of **Hashabiah**, and father of **Abdi**, 1 Chron. vi. 44.

MALLUCH, one of those who separated from his foreign wife, Ezra x. 29.

MAMRE, an Amorite, brother of **Aner** and **Eshcol**, and a friend of **Abraham**, Gen. xiv. 13.

MANAEN, or **MANAHEM**, a coadjutor of the Apostles, was the foster brother of **Herod Antipas**. It is thought he was one of the **Seventy Disciples**. He was at **Antioch** with others when **St Paul** and **St Barnabas** were commissioned to preach to the Gentiles, Acts xiii. 1.

MANASSEH, eldest son of the Patriarch **Joseph**, and ancestor of the tribe called by his name, Gen. xli. 50, 51.

MANATHATH, son of **Shebal**, Gen. xxxvi. 23.

MAOCH, father of **Achish**, king of **Gath**, 1 Sam. xxvii. 2.

MARESHA, son of **Laadah**, 1 Chron. iv. 21.

MARY, the mother of **St James** and **St John**, Matt. xxvii. 56.

MARY, a Christian female commended by St Paul for "labouring much in the faith," Rom. xvi. 6.

MASH, or **MES**, the fourth son of Aram, Gen. x. 23; called Meshech, 1 Chron. i. 17.

MASREKAH, chief or duke of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 36.

MASSA, seventh son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 14.

MATRED, daughter of Mezahab, mother of Mehatabel, wife of Hadar, Gen. xxxvi. 39.

MATRI, chief of the family of Kish, father of Saul, 1 Sam. x. 21.

MATTAN, the son of Shephatiah, Jer. xxxviii. 1.

MATTAN, priest of Baal, was killed before the altar of that idol by order of the high priest Jehoiada, 2 Kings xi. 18.

MATTAN, or **MATHAN**, son of Eleazar, the father of Jacob and grandfather of Joseph, who was betrothed to the Virgin Mary, Matt. i. 15, 16; Luke iii. 23.

MATTANIAH, a name of Zedekiah, king of Judah.

MATTANIAH, or **MATHANIAH**, chief of the ninth family of the Levites, 1 Chron. xxvi. 16.

MATTANIAH, son of Heman, a Levite, 1 Chron. xxv. 4.

MATTATHA, son of Hashum, was one of those who put away their idolatrous wives after the return from Babylon, Ezra x. 33.

MATTATHA, or **MATHATA**, son of Nathan, and father of Menan, in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 31.

MATTENAI, son of Hashum, Ezra x. 33.

MATTHAT, son of Levi, and father of Heli, Luke iii. 24.

MATTHITHIAH, of the race of Korah, was head of the fourteenth family of the Levites, 1 Chron. xxvi. 21.

MEBUNNAI, or **MOBANIA**, the Hushashite, a valiant man of David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 17. He is the same as Sibbecai of Hushah, 1 Chron. xi. 29.

MEDAD, was divinely appointed along with Eldad to assist Moses in the government of the Israelites, Numb. xi.

26-30. The Rabbins have various contradictory traditions concerning them.

MEDAN, or **MADAN**, third son of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2.

MEHETABEL, son of Delaiah, Neh. vi. 10.

MEHIDA, a person whose family returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 52; Neh. vii. 54.

MEHIR, son of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 11.

MEHUJAEI, son of Irad, and father of Methusael, of the race of Cain, Gen. iv. 18.

MEHUMAN, a Persian appellative, chief of the eunuchs of King Ahasuerus, Esther i. 10.

MEHUSHIM, father of Ahitub, 1 Chron. viii. 11.

MELATIAH, a Gibeonite who assisted in building the walls of Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 7.

MELCHI, son of Janna, and father of Levi, in the genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 24.

MELCHI, son of Addi, and father of Neri, in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 28.

MELCHIAH, head of the fifth of the twenty-four sacerdotal families, 1 Chron. xxiv. 9.

MELEAS, son of Menan, and father of Eliakim, in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 31.

MELECH, son of Micah, and grandson of Jonathan, the son of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 35.

MELICU, one of the priests in the time of Joiakim, Neh. xii. 14.

MELZAR, a Chaldean appellative, the governor of Daniel and his companions when captives at Babylon, Dan. i. 16.

MEMUCAN, a Persian appellative, one of the seven principal councillors of the king of Persia, Esther i. 14, 16.

MEONOTHAI, son of Othniel, and father of Ophrah of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 13, 14.

MEPHIBOSHETH, son of Saul by Rizpah, put to death by the Gibeonites, 2 Sam. xxi. 8, 9.

MERAB, or **MEROB**, eldest daughter of Saul, king of Israel. She was promised to David in marriage as a reward for his victory over Goliath, but was given to Adriel, the son of Barzillai the Meholathite, 1 Sam. xiv. 49; xviii. 17, 19. Merab had six sons by this husband, who were all delivered to the Gibeonites, who "hanged them before the Lord." The text enumerates that those six unfortunate persons were sons of Michal, another daughter of Saul, and wife of Adriel, but we know that Michal did not marry Adriel, and we nowhere read that she had six sons. It is consequently inferred that Michal has crept into the text instead of Merab. Some think that those six were sons of Merab by birth, and of Michal by adoption.

MERAIOTH, son of Ahitub, high priest of the Jews, 1 Chron. ix. 11.

MERAIOTH, son of Zeraiah, is probably the same person, Ezra vii. 3.

MERAIOTH, a priest of the race of Aaron, son of Zerahiah, and father of Amariah, among the high priests, 1 Chron. vi. 6.

MERARI, third son of Levi, Exod. vi. 19.

MERED, son of Ezra, 1 Chron. vi. 17.

MEREMOTH, son of Urijah, divorced his idolatrous wife, Ezra x. 36.

MEREMOTH, a priest who returned from Babylon, and who set up the vessels of gold and silver which had been restored to the Temple by King Artaxerxes, Ezra viii. 33.

MERES, a prince at the court of Ahasuerus, Esther i. 14.

MERIAH, son of Seraiah, of the race of the priests, returned to Jerusalem from Babylon, Neh. xii. 12.

MERIB-BAAI, or **MERIBAAL**, son of Jonathan, and father of Micah, 1 Chron. viii. 34; ix. 40. Merib-baal is Mephibosheth, 2 Sam. iv. 4; ix. 12. The Hebrews scrupled to pronounce the name of Baal, so that instead of Mephibosheth, or Meri-bosheth, they chose to say Mephibosheth, or Meri-bosheth.

MERODACH, an ancient king of

Babylon, placed among the gods, and worshipped by the Babylonians, Jer. i. 2. There are several kings of the Babylonians whose names comprise that of Merodach.

MESHA, or **MOSA**, son of Bela and Hodesh, 1 Chron. viii. 9.

MESHA, king of Moab, fed a great number of flocks, and paid Ahab, king of Israel, a hundred thousand lambs, and as many rams, with their fleeces, 2 Kings iii. 4. After the death of Ahab, he revolted against Jehoram, who declared war against him, and called to his assistance Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and the tributary king or governor of Idumea. Their united forces marched against Mesha, defeated him, and forced him to retire to Areopolis, his capital. They besieged him so closely that not being able to escape through the camp of the Idumeans, which he attacked, he took his son and presumptive heir, and brought him upon the wall of the city with the intention of sacrificing him. When the assailants saw this they retired without taking the city, but they committed great havoc throughout the country of Moab.

MESHA, eldest son of Caleb, son of Hezron, different from Caleb, son of Jephunneh. He was father of Ziph, or the Ziphians, in Judea, 1 Chron. ii. 42.

MESHACH, a Chaldean name given to Mizael, one of Daniel's companions at Babylon.

MESHECH, or **Mosoc**, sixth son of Japhet, Gen. x. 2.

MESHELEMLIAH, father of Zechariah, a Levite and porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. ix. 21.

MESHELEMLIAH, son of Korah, was the father of several guards or porters of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 2, 9.

MESHEZABEEL, grandfather of Meshullam, who assisted to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 4; x. 21; xi. 24.

MESHILLEMITH, father of Meshullam, and son of Immer, 1 Chron. ix. 12. Also the name of the father of Ahasaia, Neh. xi. 13.

MESHULLAM, son of Hodaviah, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. ix. 7.

MESHULLAM, son of Shephathiah, 1 Chron. ix. 8.

MESHULLAM, son of Abihail, 1 Chron. v. 13.

MESHULLAM, son of Meshillemith, 1 Chron. ix. 12.

MESHULLAM, a descendant of Kohath, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12.

MESHULLAM, son of Besodeiah, Neh. iii. 6.

MESHULLAM, son of Berechiah, Neh. iii. 4.

MESHULLEMETH, daughter of Haruz of Jotbah, was wife of Manasseh, king of Judah, 2 Kings xxi. 19.

METHUSAEL, son of Mehujael, of the race of Cain, Gen. iv. 18.

MEZAHAB, mother of Matred, Gen. xxxvi. 39.

MIAMIN, son of Parosh, was one of those who divorced their strange wives after the return from the Captivity, Ezra x. 25.

MIBHAR, son of Haggeri, a valiant man of David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 38.

MIBRAM, son of Shallum, 1 Chron. iv. 25.

MIBSAM, or **MAHSAM**, son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 13.

MIBZAR, the successor of Taman in the principality of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 42.

MICAH, son of Zichri, and father of Mattaniah, 1 Chron. ix. 15.

MICAH, son of Merib-baal, also called Mephibosheth, 2 Sam. ix. 6, 12.

MICAH, father of Achbor, 2 Kings xxii. 22.

MICAH, son of Joel, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 5.

MICAH, or **MICAHU**, of Ephraim, son of a sick widow of the tribe of Dan. His story is related in the 17th and 18th chapters of the Book of Judges. He made an ephod, or priestly habit, and images of metal, and first constituted one of his own sons a priest, but he afterwards procured a young Levite. It is supposed that this happened in the interval between the death of Joshua and the promotion of Othniel to judge Israel.

MICAHIAH, or **MAACHAH**, mother of Abijah, king of Judah.

MICAHIAH, son of Imlah, of the tribe of Ephraim, a prophet who flourished in the reign of Ahab, king of the Ten Tribes. His prediction of the fate of that prince and the proceedings of the king against him are recorded in the 22d chapter of the First Book of Kings. See **AHAB**.

MICAHIAH, son of Gemariah, informed the princes of Judah that Baruch had read the predictions of Jeremiah in the Temple before all the people, Jer. xxxvi. 11.

MICHAEL, father of Sethur, one of the spies sent by Moses to examine the Promised Land, Numb. xiii. 13.

MICHAEL, son of Jeshishai, and father of Gilead, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. v. 13, 14.

MICHAEL, son of Uzzi, of the tribe of Issachar, 1 Chron. vii. 3.

MICHAEL, of the tribe of Manasseh, was one of David's valiant followers, 1 Chron. xii. 20.

MICHAEL, son of King Jehoshaphat, was murdered with his brothers by King Jehoram after the death of Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xxi. 2.

MICHAL, or **MICHOI**, daughter of Saul, and wife of David. When her father sent to David's house to secure him, she let him down by a window, and he escaped. Some time after this Saul gave her in marriage to Phalti, or Phaltiel, son of Laish. When David obtained the crown he caused Michal to be restored to him, which was one condition that he stipulated with Abner. The Jews allege that Phaltiel never cohabited with Michal, who properly could not be his wife, as she had never been divorced from David. Others believe that she had five sons by Phaltiel, who were put to death by the Gibeonites, 2 Sam. xxi. 8, 9.

MICHRI, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. ix. 8.

MIDIAN, or **MADIAN**, fourth son of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2.

MIDIAN, probably the son of Cush,

because Zipporah, the wife of Moses, although a Midianite, was also a Cushite, Numb. xii. 1.

MIJAMIN, a priest of the sixth sacerdotal family, 1 Chron. xxiv. 9.

MIKLOTH, or **MACELLOTH**, son of Abi-Gibeon, or Jehiel, and father of Shimea, or Shimeam, 1 Chron. viii. 31, 32; ix. 37, 38.

MIKLOTH, a captain in David's army, who commanded 24,000 men under Dodai, the Ahohite, 1 Chron. xxvii. 4.

MIKNIAH, a priest, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

MILALAI, a musician, Neh. xii. 36.

MILCAH, or **MELCHA**, daughter of Aram, and sister of Lot, was the wife of Nahor, the niece of Abraham, and mother of Bethuel, Gen. xxiv. 15.

MILCAH, one of the daughters of Zelophehad, Numb. xxvi. 33.

MIRIAM, the sister of Moses and Aaron, and the daughter of Amram and Jochebed, was born about B.C. 1580. It is thought that she was the wife of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, but it does not appear that she had any children. Miriam had the gift of prophecy, as she intimates, Exod. xvii. 10, 11; Numb. xii. 2. She died in the first month of the fortieth year after the departure of the Israelites from Egypt at the encampment of Kadesh in the Wilderness of Sin. She was there buried, and Eusebius assures us that in his time her sepulchre was to be seen. Josephus says that she was interred with great solemnity at the public expense, and that the Hebrews mourned for her a whole month.

MIRMA, son of Shabaraim, 1 Chron. viii. 20.

MISHAEL, or **MISAEI**, one of the three

companions of Daniel, to whom Nebuchadnezzar gave the Chaldean name of **MESHACH**. He was one of the three cast into the burning furnace, from which he and his companions were miraculously delivered, Dan. i. 7; iii. 12.

MISHAM, son of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 12.

MISHMA, fifth son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 14.

MISHMANNAH, a valiant leader in David's army, 1 Chron. xii. 10.

MISPERETH, one of the chief men who returned from Babylon with Zerubabel, Neh. vii. 7.

MITHREDAH, or **MITRIDATES**, son of Gazabar, by order of Cyrus returned to Sheshbazzar, prince of Judah, the vessels of the Temple, Ezra i. 8.

MITHRIDATH, or **MITHRIDATES**, one who signed the letter to King Ahasuerus to prevent the Jews from rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, Ezra iv. 7.

MIZRAM, or **MIZR**, son of Ham, Gen. x. 6.

MIZZAH, fourth son of Reuel, son of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 13.

MOAB, son of Lot, and father of the Moabites, Gen. xix. 31, &c.

MOLID, son of Abishur and Abihail, 1 Chron. ii. 29.

MOZA, or **Mosa**, son of Caleb and Ephah, 1 Chron. ii. 46.

MOZA, son of Zimri, and father of Binea, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 36.

MUPPIM, or **MOPHIM**, son of Benjamin, Gen. xli. 21; Numb. xxvi. 39.

MUSHI, or **Musi**, son of Merari, chief of a family of Levites, Numb. iii. 33; 1 Chron. vi. 19.

N

NAAM, one of the sons of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 15.

NAAMAH, daughter of Lamech and

Zillah, and sister of Tubal-cain, Gen. iv. 22. She is said to have invented the art of spinning wool.

NAAMAH, an Ammonitess, wife of Solomon, and mother of Rehoboam, 1 Kings xiv. 21.

NAAMAN, son of Benjamin, Gen. xvi. 21.

NAAMAN, son of Zela, and grandson of Benjamin, was head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 40; 1 Chron. viii. 4.

NAARAH, wife of Ashur, 1 Chron. iv. 5.

NAARAI, a valiant man in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 37.

NAASHON, son of Aminadab, Exod. vi. 23.

NACHON, a man who gave his name to a threshing-floor, 2 Sam. vi. 6.

NADAB, son of Shammai, and father of Seled and Appaim, 1 Chron. ii. 30.

NAGGE, father of Eali, Luke iii. 25.

NAHAM, father of Keilah, 1 Chron. iv. 19.

NAHAMANI, one who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel, Neh. vii. 7.

NAHARAI, a native of Beeroth, was a man of great valour, and armour-bearer to Joab, 2 Sam. xxiii. 37.

NAHASH, father of Abigail and Zeruiah, is thought to be the same as Jesse, the father of David, 2 Sam. xvii. 25, compared with 1 Chron. ii. 13, 15, 16. This might perhaps be a surname of Jesse. Others think that this may be the name of Jesse's wife, the mother of David.

NAHASH, father of Shobi, and the friend of David, 2 Sam. xvii. 27, was probably Nahash, king of the Ammonites.

NAHASSON, son of Aminadab, and head of the tribe of Judah, at the departure from Egypt was the first chief who made his offering to the tabernacle in the second year of the sojourn in the Wilderness, Numb. vii. 12, 13.

NAHATH, son of Reuel, and grandson of Eaan, Gen. xxxvi. 13.

NAHATH, an overseer of the store-room in the Temple, 2 Chron. xxxi. 13.

NAHBI, son of Vophsi, one of the spies sent by Moses to take a survey of the Promised Land, Numb. xiii. 14.

NAHOR, son of Serug, was father of

Terah, and grandfather of Abraham, died in the hundred and forty-eighth year of his age, Gen. xi. 26.

NAPHISH, son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv 15; 1 Chron. i. 31.

NAPHTALI, sixth son of Jacob by Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid, progenitor of the tribe which bore his name, Gen. xxx. 8.

NAPHTUHIM, fourth son of Mizraim, Gen. x. 13.

NARCISSUS, a Roman of some note, the Christians of whose household St Paul salutes, Rom. xvi. 11.

NATHAN, son of David and Bathsheba, 2 Sam. v. 14; 1 Chron. iii. 5, was father of Mattatha, Luke iii. 31.

NATHAN, father of Egal, 2 Sam. xxiii. 36, and brother of Joel, 1 Chron. xi. 38.

NATHAN, father of Zabud, a priest, 1 Kings iv. 5.

NATHAN, father of Azariah, 1 Kings iv. 5.

NATHAN, one of the chiefs of the Jews who returned from Babylon with Ezra (viii. 16).

NATHANAEL, or **NATHANEEL**, son of Zuar, head or prince of the tribe of Issachar at the departure from Egypt, made his oblations to the tabernacle as chief of his tribe, Numb. i. 8; vii. 18, 19.

NATHANAEL, fourth son of Jesse and brother of David, 1 Chron. ii. 14.

NATHANAEL, son of Obededom, of the race of the priests, 1 Chron. xv. 24; xxvi. 4.

NATHANAEL, a doctor of the Law, sent by Jehoshaphat to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 7.

NATHANAEL, father of Shemaiah, a Levite, 1 Chron. xxiv. 6.

NATHANAEL, a Levite in the time of King Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv. 9.

NATHANAEL, a person who returned from the Captivity, Ezra x. 22.

NATHAN-MELECH, an officer or eunuch of Manasseh, king of Judah, who had the care of the chariots consecrated to the sun, 2 Kings xxiii. 11.

NAUM, the same as **NAHUM**, in the genealogy of our Saviour, Luke iii. 23.

NEARIAH, the fifth son of Shechaniah was one of those who, at the head of five hundred men, attacked the remnant of the Amalekites in Mount Seir, defeated them, and took possession of their country, 1 Chron. iii. 22; iv. 42. The time of this expedition is not known.

NEBAI, one of the chiefs who sealed the covenant, Neh. x. 19.

NEBAJOTH, eldest son of Ishmael, and grandson of Abraham and Hagar, was the ancestor of the Nabathean Arab tribes.

NEBAT, or **NABATH**, of the tribe of Ephraim, of the race of Joshua, was father of Jeroboam, first king of the Ten Tribes, 1 Kings xi. 26.

NEBUSHASBAN, or **NABUSESBAN**, general of Nebuchadnezzar, went with Nebuzaradan to take Jeremiah out of prison, Jer. xxxix. 11.

NEDABIAH, son of Jeconiah, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

NEHUSHTA, daughter of Elnathan, and mother of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, 2 Kings xxiv. 8.

NEKODA, a person whose descendants returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 48, 60.

NEMUEL, son of Simeon, was head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 9.

NEMUEL, son of Eliab, of the tribe of Reuben, was brother to Dathan and Abiram, Numb. xxxvi. 9.

NEPHEG, a son of King David, 2 Sam. v. 15; 1 Chron. xiv. 6.

NER, a relation of Saul, son of Asiel, and father of Abner, the general of Saul's army, 1 Sam. xiv. 50, 51.

NEREUS, and his sister, are persons saluted by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 15.

NERI, son of Melchi, and father of Salathiel in our Saviour's human genealogy, Luke iii. 27.

NERIAH, or **NERI**, father of Baruch, Jer. xxiii. 12.

NETHAMAH, a Levite, head of the fifth band of musicians, 1 Chron. xxv. 2, 12.

NETHAMAH, of the royal family of Judah, was father of Ishmael, who slew Gedaliah, 2 Kings xxv. 23.

NETOPHATI, son of Salma, 1 Chron. ii. 54.

NEZIAH, one of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 54.

NIMSHI, father of Jehu, king of the Ten Tribes, 1 Kings xix. 16.

NOGAH, a son of David, 1 Chron. iii. 7; xiv. 6.

NOHAH, fourth son of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 2.

NUN, son of Elishama, of the tribe of Ephraim, and father of Joshua, the conqueror of Canaan.

NYMPHAS, is saluted by Paul, Col. iv. 15.

O

OBADIAH, or **OB DIAH**, second son of Uzzi, of the tribe of Issachar, 1 Chron. vii. 3.

OBADIAH, son of Arnan, and father of Shechaniah, 1 Chron. iii. 21.

OBADIAH, son of Shemaiah, of the race of the Levites, 1 Chron. ix. 16.

OBADIAH, son of Azel, of the family of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 38.

OBADIAH, a valiant man in David's army, who joined him in the wilderness, 1 Chron. xii. 9.

OBADIAH, one of those whom Je-

hoshaphat sent to the cities of Judah to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 7.

OBADIAH, one of the principal citizens of Jerusalem who signed the covenant, Neh. x. 5.

OBAL, or **EBAL**, eighth son of Joktan, Gen. x. 28.

OBED, son of Boaz and Ruth, father of Jesse, Ruth iv. 17.

OBED, son of Ephtal, father of Jehu, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 37.

OBEDEDOM, son of Jedathun, a Levite, and progenitor of a numerous

family, because "the Lord blessed him," 1 Chron. xvi. 38; xxvi. 4. To him and his sons was assigned the keeping of the doors of the Temple, 1 Chron. xv. 18, 21. He is called the *Gittite*, probably because he was a native of the Levitical city of Gath-Rimmon, 2 Sam. vi. 10.

OBIL, or UBIL, an Ishmaelite, master of the camels to King David, 1 Chron. xxvii. 30. It is thought that this name simply indicates his profession—a *camel herd*.

OCRAN, father of Pagiel, of the tribe of Asher, Numb. i. 13.

ODAIA, or HODAJAH, a Levite, Neh. ix. 5.

ODED, father of the Prophet Azariah, called *Obed* in some ancient Bibles and Latin Concordances, 2 Chron. xv. 1.

ODED, a prophet who was at Samaria when the Ten Tribes returned from the war against Judah with an immense number of captives. By his remonstrances the prisoners were released, kindly treated, and conducted to the frontiers of their own country, 2 Chron. xxviii. 9.

OG, king of Bashan, was a giant of the race of the Rephaim, Deut. iii. 11. The Rabbins narrate some foolish traditions of him.

OHAD, third son of Simeon, went with his father and grandfather Jacob to Egypt, Gen. xlv. 10.

OHEL, son of Zerubbabel, and grandson of Josiah, 1 Chron. iii. 20.

OLYMPAS, a Christian at Rome saluted by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 15.

OMAI, second son of Eliphaz, and grandson of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 11, 15.

OMRI, son of Becher, of the tribe of Issachar, 1 Chron. vii. 8.

OMRI, son of Michael, of the tribe of Issachar, chief of his family in David's time, 1 Chron. xxvii. 18.

ON, the son of Peleth, of the tribe of Reuben, Numb. xvi. 1.

ONAM, son of Shobal, Gen. xxxvi. 23.

ONAN, son of Judah, and grandson of Jacob, Gen. xxxviii. 6.

ONO, second son of Lod, Ezra ii. 33.

OPHIR, son of Joktan, Gen. x. 26–30.

OPHRAH, son of Meonothai, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 44.

OREB, a prince of the Midianites, killed with Zeeb, another chief of the same people, Judges vii. 25.

ORPAH, a Moabitess, wife of Chilion, the son of Elimelech and Naomi, Ruth i. 9, 10, &c.

OTHNI, son of Shemaiah, a valiant man in David's army, 1 Chron. xxvi. 7.

OZEM, or AZEM, sixth son of Jesse, and brother of David, 1 Chron. ii. 15.

OZEM, son of Jerahmeel, 1 Chron. ii. 25.

OZNI, son of Gad, head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 15.

P

PAARAI, an Arbite, a valiant man in David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 35, called Naarai, son of Ezbai, 1 Chron. xi. 37.

PADON, a chief of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 44; Neh. vii. 72.

PAGIEL, son of Ocran, was chief of the tribe of Asher, Numb. vii. 72.

PALAL, son of Uzai, Neh. iii. 25.

PALTI, or PHALTI, son of Raphu, was one of the spies sent to examine the Promised Land, Numb. xiii. 9.

PALTIEL, son of Azzan, of Issachar,

one of those appointed to allot the Land of Canaan, Numb. xxxiv. 26.

PARMASTHA, the seventh son of Haman, Esther ix. 9.

PARMENAS, one of the seven deacons, Acts vi. 5, 6.

PARNACH, father of Elizaphan, of Zebulun, Numb. xxxiv. 25.

PAROSH, a person whose family and servants, in number two thousand one hundred and seventy-two, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 3; viii. 3; x. 25.

PARSHANDATHA, eldest son of Haman, the minister of Ahasuerus, Esther ix. 7.

PARUAH, father of Jehoshaphat, of the tribe of Issachar, who was one of King Solomon's provincial governors, 1 Kings iv. 17.

PASACH, son of Japhlet, 1 Chron. vii. 33.

PASEAH, son of Eshton, and grandson of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 12.

PASHUR, a descendant of Immer, Jer. xx. 1. Also the name of a person whose family and dependants, in number twelve hundred and forty-seven, returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 38; Neh. vii. 41.

PATHRUSIM, the fifth son of Mizraim.

PATROBAS, a disciple mentioned by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 4.

PEDAHEL, son of Ammihud, of the tribe of Naphtali, was one of those appointed by Moses to allot the Promised Land, Numb. xxxiv. 28.

PEDAHZUR, father of Gamaliel, Numb. i. 10; ii. 20; vii. 54.

PEDAHIAH, of the city of Rumah, was father of Zebudah, the mother of King Jehoiakim, 2 Kings xxiii. 36.

PEDAHIAH, son of Jeconiah, king of Judah, was father of Zerubbabel and Shimei, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

PEDAHIAH, son of Parosh, Neh. iii. 25; viii. 4.

PELAIAH, one of the principal Levites who returned from the Captivity, and afterwards signed the covenant, Neh. viii. 7; xi. 10.

PELALIAH, son of Anzi, father of Jehoram, of the family of Pashur, son of Malchiah, a priest, Neh. xi. 12.

PELATIAH, **PHALTIAH**, or **PHELTI**, son of Hananiah, and father of Ishi, of the tribe of Simeon, gained a victory over the Amalekites of Mount Seir, 1 Chron. iv. 42.

PELATIAH, or **PHELTI**, son of Benaiab, a prince of the people who lived in the reign of Zedekiah, and opposed the advice given by Jeremiah to submit to Nebuchadnezzar, Ezek. xi. 1, &c.

PELEG, or **PHALEG**, son of Eber, Gen. x. 25. The inspired historian informs us that his name, which signifies *division*, originated from the circumstance that in his time the earth was divided.

PELET, son of Azmaveth, was a valiant man in David's army who joined him at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xii. 3.

PELETH, son of Pallu, of the tribe of Reuben, father of On and Jethiel, Numb. xvi. 1.

PENNINAH, second wife of Elkanah, the father of the Prophet Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 2, &c.

PENUËL, son of Hur, of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 4.

PENUEL, son of Shashak, 1 Chron. viii. 25.

PERUDA, chief of a family of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 55.

PETHATHIAH, head of the nineteenth family of priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 16.

PETHUEL, or **PHATUEL**, father of the Prophet Joel (i. 1).

PEULTHAI, of the race of the Levites, the eighth in order of the porters of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 5.

PHALLU, second son of Reuben, and father of Eliab, was head of a family, Gen. xlii. 9; Numb. xxvi. 5.

PHALTI, son of Laish, married Michal, the daughter of Saul, after her father had taken her from David, 1 Sam. xxv. 44.

PHANUEL, father of the widow and prophetess Anna, Luke ii. 36, &c.

PHAREZ, son of Judah and Tamar, and father of Hezron and Hamul, Gen. xxxviii. 27, 28; Numb. xxvi. 20, 21.

PHAREZ, son of Machir, 1 Chron. vii. 16.

PHICHIOL, commander of the army of Abimelech, king of Gerar, Gen. xxi. 22.

PHINEHAS, or, as the Jews pronounce the name, **PINCHAS**, son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron, was the third high priest of the Jews. He is particularly commended in Scripture for his zeal in vindicating the glory of God when the Midianites sent their daughters among

the Israelites to seduce them to idolatry, Numb. xxv. 7. The Rabbins assign a very long life to Phinehas, and the time of his death is uncertain.

PHINEHAS, son of Eli, the high priest, was brother of Hophni, 1 Sam. iv. 4, &c.

PHLEGON, according to the Greek tradition bishop of Marathon, is mentioned by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 14.

PHURAH, servant of Gideon, went with his master to spy the camp of the Midianites, Judges vii. 10, 11.

PHUT, or PHUTH, the third son of Ham, Gen. x. 6.

PHYGELLUS, a Christian of Asia, who being at Rome when St Paul was imprisoned there, forsook him along with Hermogenes, 2 Tim. i. 15.

PILDASH, son of Nahor and Milcah, Gen. xxii. 22.

PILEHA, a chief priest who signed the covenant, Neh. x. 24.

PIRAM, king of Jarmuth, was put to death by Joshua (x. 3, 24-26).

PISPAH, son of Jether, 1 Chron. vii. 38.

PITHON, son of Micah, 1 Chron. viii. 35; ix. 41.

PORETHA, a Midian or Persian name, one of the sons of Haman, Esther ix. 8.

POTIPHAR, an Egyptian name, an officer of Pharaoh, Gen. xxxvii. 36, prominently noticed in the history of Joseph.

POTIPHERAH, priest of On, or Heliopolis, and father of Asenath, the wife of Joseph, by whom he had Ephraim and Manasseh, Gen. xli.

PRISCILLA, or PRISCA, a Christian female, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and in St Paul's Epistles, 2 Tim. iv. 19. She was the wife of Aquila, and was at Rome with her husband when St Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, A.D. 58. In that Epistle (xvi. 5), he salutes them first with great commendations.

PROCHORUS, or PROCORUS, one of the seven apostolical deacons, Acts vi. 5.

PUTIEL, or PHUTIEL, grandfather of the high priest Phinehas, Exod. vi. 25.

Q

QUARTUS, a disciple and coadjutor of the Apostles mentioned by St Paul, Rom. xvi. 23. According to the tradi-

tion of the Greek Church he was one of the Seventy Disciples, and afterwards bishop of Berytus.

R

RAAMAH, fourth son of Cush, Gen. x. 7; Ezek. xxvii. 22.

RAAMAH, or RAAMIAH, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, Neh. vii. 7.

RAB-MAG, a Babylonian name, an officer of Nebuchadnezzar's army at the capture of Jerusalem, Jer. xxxix. 3.

RAB-SARIS, a title of office held by the Assyrian officer who was sent with

Rabshakeh and Tartan to summon Hezekiah to surrender, 2 Kings xviii. 17; Jer. xxxix. 3.

RABSHAKEH, also a title of office, signifying *cupbearer of the prince*, or *chamberlain*, 2 Kings xviii. 17.

RACHEL, daughter of Laban and sister of Leah, was the favourite and beloved wife of Jacob, particularly noticed in his history. See JACOB.

RADDAL, fifth son of Jesse, was one of David's brothers, 1 Chron. ii. 14.

RAGUEL, a surname of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses.

RAHAM, son of Shema, father of Jorkoam, of the race of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 44.

RAKEM, son of Shareth, of the tribe of Gad, and family of Machir, 1 Chron. vii. 16.

RAM, son of Hezron, and father of Aminadab, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 9.

RAMIAH, son of Parosh, one of the singers in the Temple, returned from Babylon, Ezra x. 25.

RAMOTH, son of Bani, Ezra x. 29.

RAPHA, fifth son of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 2.

RAPHA, son of Tola, of the tribe of Issachar, 1 Chron. vii. 25.

RAPHIA, or **REPHAIAH**, son of Binea, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 37.

REIAH, son of Jobal, and father of Jahath, 1 Chron. iv. 2.

REIAH, son of Micah, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 5. Also the name of a person whose family returned from Babylon, Neh. vii. 50.

REBA, a prince of the Midianites, killed in the war carried on against them for seducing the Israelites to idolatry, Numb. xxxi. 8.

RECHAB and **BAANAH**, the assassins of Ish-bosheth, son of Saul.

RECHAB, father of Jonadab, and progenitor of the Rechabites. It is not known when he lived, or what was his origin, Jer. xxxv. 6, 7.

REELIAH, one of the priests who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel, Ezra ii. 2.

REGEM, son of Jakhai, 1 Chron. ii. 47.

REGEM-MELECH, a Midian name, and **SHEREZER**, sent a deputation to the priests and prophets at Jerusalem, to know if they intended to fast on the fifth month of the holy year in memory of the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, Zech. vii. 2.

REHABIAH, eldest son of Eliezer,

and grandson of Moses, 1 Chron. xxiii. 17; xxvi. 25. He and his brethren were Levites, and treasurers of the Temple.

REHOB, father of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, 2 Sam. viii. 3.

REHOB, an Israelite who returned from Babylon, Neh. x. 11.

REHSA, one of the human ancestors of our Saviour, Luke iii. 27.

REHUM, a Levite, and son of Bani, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, Ezra ii. 2; Neh. iii. 17; xii. 3.

REHUM, an opponent of the Jews, Ezra iv. 8, 9, 17, 23.

REKEM, prince of Midian, slain by Phinehas, Numb. xxxi. 8.

REKEM, son of Hebron, and brother of Korah, 1 Chron. ii. 43.

REMALIAH, father of Pekah, king of Israel, 2 Kings xv. 25.

REPHAEL, a son of Shemaiah, the first-born of Obededom, 1 Chron. xxvi. 4, 7.

REPHAH, or **RAPHA**, son of Beriah, and grandson of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 25.

REPHAIAH, a son of Tola, 1 Chron. vii. 2.

RESHEPIH, son of Rephah, a grandson of Sarah, daughter of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 25.

REUBEN, eldest son of Jacob, by Leah, was progenitor of the tribe which bears his name, Gen. xxix. 32.

REUEL, son of Esau and Bashemath, daughter of Ishmael, Gen. xxxvi. 4, 17.

REUMAH, concubine of Nahor, the brother of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 24.

REZIA, daughter of Ulla, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 39.

REZIN, a king of Syria, who combined with Pekah, king of Israel, to invade Judah, 2 Kings xv. 37, 38; xvi. 5, 6; 2 Chron. xxviii. 5-7.

REZIN, an Israelite who returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 48; Neh. vii. 50.

RHESA, son of Zerubbabel, Luke iii. 27.

RHODA, a female of the household of Mary, the mother of John surnamed Mark, Acts xii. 13, 14.

RIBAI, father of Ittai, of the tribe of

Benjamin, one of David's heroes, 2 Sam. xxiii. 29.

RIMMON, of Beeroth, the father of **Baanah** and **Beriah** who murdered **Ish-bosheth**, 2 Sam. iv. 5, 9.

RINAH, son of **Shimon**, of the tribe of **Judah**, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

RIPHATH, second son of **Gomer**, and grandson of **Japheth**, Gen. x. 3, called *Diphath*, 1 Chron. i. 6. This occurs from the close resemblance of the Hebrew letters *resh* and *daleth*.

RIZPAH, daughter of **Arah**, concubine of **King Saul**, 2 Sam. iii. 7, 11; xxi. 1, 3, &c.

ROHGAH, son of **Shamer**, of the tribe of **Asher**, 2 Sam. xvii. 27; xix. 32.

ROMAMTI-EZER, son of **Heman**, 1 Chron. xxv. 4, 31.

ROSH, or **Ros**, son of **Benjamin**, Gen. xlv. 21.

RUFUS, mentioned in **Rom.** xvi. 13, is probably **Rufus**, son of **Simon the Cyrenian**.

S

SABTAH, or **SABATHA**, the third son of **Cush**, Gen. x. 7.

SABTECHA, the fifth son of **Cush**, Gen. x. 7.

SACAR, father of **Ahiam**, a hero of **David's** army, 1 Chron. xi. 35.

SACAR, a son of **Obededom**, 1 Chron. xxvi. 4.

SADOC, son of **Azor**, and father of **Achim** in the genealogy of our Saviour, **Matt.** i. 14.

SALAH, or **SALEH**, son of **Cainan**, and grandson of **Arphaxad**, Gen. xi. 12, &c.

SALATHIEL, son of **Jeconiah**, and father of **Zerubbabel**, 1 Chron. iii. 17. He died at **Babylon**, and the Jews allege that he was their titular prince during the Captivity. **St Matthew** traces his descent from **Solomon** by **Rehoboam**, and **St Luke** deduces it from **Solomon** by **Nathan**, so that in him were united the two branches of this family.

SALLAI, or **CELAJ**, of the race of the priests, **Neh.** xii. 20.

SALLU, or **SALO**, son of **Meshullam**, of **Benjamin**, 1 Chron. ix. 7.

SALMON, son of **Nashon**, married **Rahab**, by whom he had **Boaz**, **Ruth** iv. 20, 21; **Matt.** i. 4.

SALOME, wife of **Zebedee**, was one of the devout women who attended our Saviour in his journeys. She was the mother of **St James** called the *Great*, and

of **St John the Evangelist**, **Matt.** xxvi. 55, 56; **Mark** xv. 40; xvi. 1, 2.

SAMGAR-NEBO, a prince of **Babylon**, **Jer.** xxxix. 3.

SAMIR, a Levite, son of **Michah**.

SAMLAH, or **SAMLA**, king of **Masrekah** in **Idumea**, Gen. xxxvi. 36.

SANBALLAT, chief or governor of the **Cuthites** or **Samaritans**, was a determined opponent of the **Jews**. He was a native of **Horon**, or **Horonaim**, a city in the country of the **Moabites**. His conduct is minutely narrated in the **Book of Nehemiah**. See **NEHEMIAH**.

SAPH, or **SIPPAI**, of the race of the giants, was killed by **Sibbechai the Hushathite**, 2 Sam. xxi. 18; 1 Chron. xx. 4.

SAPPHIRA, the wife of **Ananias**, mentioned in the **Acts** of the **Apostles**, was struck suddenly dead with her husband for prevarication and "lying unto the Holy Ghost."

SARAH, or **SARAI**, the wife of the **Patriarch Abraham**, was daughter of **Terah**, the **Patriarch's** father, by a different mother. See **ABRAHAM**.

SARAH, daughter of **Asher**, **Numb.** xxvi. 46.

SARESCHIM, a **Babylonian** appellative, signifying *chief of eunuchs*, or *officers of the court*, was an officer of the **Babylonian** army, **Jer.** xxxix. 3.

SAUL, king of **Idumea**, was of **Reho-**

both, and succeeded Samlah of Masrekah, Gen. xxxvi. 37.

SEBA, or SABA, son of Cush, Gen. x. 7.

SEGUB, son of Hezron, father of Jair, 1 Chron. ii. 21, 22.

SEGUB, the youngest son of Hiel of Bethel, was killed in fulfilment of Joshua's prediction, when his father set up the gates of Jericho, 1 Kings xvi. 34.

SEIR, or SEHIR, the Horite, an ancient chief whose descendants, before they were expelled by the posterity of Esau, dwelt east and south of the Dead Sea, Gen. xxxvi. 21-30.

SELED, son of Nadab, 1 Chron. ii. 30.

SEMACHIAH, son of Shemaiah, a Levite, was a porter belonging to the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 7.

SENUA, father of Judah, Neh. xi. 9.

SERAIAH, the secretary of King David, 2 Sam. viii. 17.

SERAIAH, father of Joab, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 14.

SERAIAH, son of Asiel, and father of Josibiah, 1 Chron. iv. 35.

SERAIAH, high priest of the Jews, was the son of Jehozadak, and the successor of Azariah. He was put to death at Riblah, with fifty chief men of the Jews, by Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings xxv. 18, 21; Jer. lli. 24-27.

SERAIAH, a chief of the Jews who returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 2; Neh. x. 2; xii. 1.

SERAIAH, son of Tanhumeth, a native of Netophah, 2 Kings xxv. 23.

SERAIAH, son of Neriah, and brother of Baruch, the companion and secretary of the Prophet Jeremiah (xxxii. 12). He was chief of the deputation appointed to carry the denunciations against Babylon.

SERED, eldest son of Zebulun, was head of a family, Gen. xlv. 14; Numb. xxvi. 26.

SERUG, or SARUG, son of Reu, and father of Nahor, Gen. xi. 20-22; 1 Chron. i. 26.

SETHUR, son of Michael, of Asher,

was one of the spies sent to search the Land of Canaan, Numb. xiii. 13.

SHIAAPH, son of Jahdai, 1 Chron. ii. 47.

SHAAPH, son of Caleb by Maachah, 1 Chron. ii. 49.

SHAASHGAZ, a Persian or Median appellative, an officer belonging to the household of King Ahasuerus, Esther ii. 14.

SHABBETHAI, one of the chief Levites over the house of God under Nehemiah (xi. 16).

SHACHIA, son of Shaharam, 1 Chron. viii. 18.

SHADRACH, or SIDRACH, a name given to Ananias, one of Daniel's three companions at Babylon, Dan. i. 7.

SHAGE, father of Jonathan, a hero in David's army, 1 Chron. xi. 34.

SAHARAIM, or SAHARAIM, son of Uzzah, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 10.

SHALLUM, chief of a family, of the tribe of Naphtali, Numb. xxvi. 49.

SHALLUM, son of Tickvah, or Tickvath, husband to the Prophetess Huldah, 2 Kings xxii. 14.

SHALLUM, son of Sisami, and father of Jekamiah, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 40.

SHALLUM, son of Shaul, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 25.

SHALLUM, fourth son of Josiah, king of Judah, 1 Chron. iii. 15; Jer. xxii. 11. He is the same as Jehoahaz, made king after the death of his father.

SHALLUM, son of the high priest Zadok, and father or uncle of Hilkiah the high priest, 1 Chron. vi. 12, 13. He is also called Meshallum, 1 Chron. ix. 11.

SHALLUM, son of Korah, 1 Chron. ix. 19, 21. He was spared when the earth opened and entombed his father. His descendants held an office in the Temple.

SHALLUM, son of Colhoseh of Mizpah, rebuilt at his own expense the Fountain Gate at Jerusalem, Neh. iii. 15.

SHALMAI, father of Hagaba, Neh. vii. 48.

SHAMA, or SAMMA, son of Hothan

the Aroerite, 1 Chron. xi. 44; is called Shammah the Harodite, 2 Sam. xxiii. 25; and Shammoth the Harorite, 1 Chron. xi. 27.

SHAMARIAH, a son of King Rehoboam, 2 Chron. xi. 19.

SHAMED, or **SAMAD**, son of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 12.

SHAMGAR-NEBO, a principal officer in the army of Nebuchadnezzar, Jer. xxxix. 3.

SHAMHUTH, or **SAMAOTH**, of Issrah, an officer of David and Solomon, 1 Chron. xxvii. 8.

SHAMIR, or **SAMIR**, son of Micah, a Levite, 1 Chron. xxiv. 24.

SHAMMAH, son of Reuel, and grandson of Esau, Gen. xxxiv. 24.

SHAMMAH, son of Jesse, and brother of David, 1 Sam. xvi. 9.

SHAMMAH, the Harorite, son of Agee, a hero in David's army, 2 Sam. xxiii. 11.

SHAMMAI, son of Rekem, and father of Maon, 1 Chron. ii. 44.

SHAMMOTH, one of David's valiant men, 1 Chron. xi. 27.

SHAMMUA, son of Zaccur, of the tribe of Reuben, was one of the spies sent to survey the Promised Land, Numb. xiii. 4.

SHAMMUA, or **SHIMEA**, a son of David and Bathsheba, 1 Chron. iii. 5.

SHAMSHERAI, son of Jeroboam, 1 Chron. viii. 26.

SHAPHAM, son of Azaliah, was secretary of the Temple in the time of King Josiah, 2 Kings xxii. 12; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 20. He informed Josiah of the discovery of the Book of the Law.

SHAPHAN, son of Gad, resided in Bashan, 1 Chron. v. 12.

SHAPHAT, son of Hori, of the tribe of Simeon, was one of the spies sent to view the Land of Canaan, Numb. xiii. 5.

SHAPHAT, of Abel-Meholah, father of the Prophet Elisha, 1 Kings xix. 16; 2 Kings iii. 11.

SHAPHAT, son of Shemaiah, of the royal family of David, by Jechoniah, 1 Chron. iii. 22.

SHAPHAT, son of Adlai, had the

chief care of David's cattle in Bashan, 1 Chron. xxvii. 29.

SHARAI, a Jew who returned from the Captivity and dismissed his wife, Ezra x. 40.

SHARAR, father of Ahiram, 2 Sam. xxiii. 33; is called Sacar, 1 Chron. xi. 35.

SHAREZER, a Persian or Assyrian name, the second son of King Sennacherib, assassinated his father while he was worshipping his idol Nisroch, 2 Kings xix. 37.

SHAREZER, an officer of King Nebuchadnezzar, Jer. xxxix. 3.

SHAREZER, a Jew who, with Regem-melech, consulted the Prophet Zechariah concerning the fast of the fifth month, Zech. vii. 2.

SHASHAK, or **SESAC**, of the tribe of Benjamin, was a citizen of Jerusalem, 1 Chron. viii. 25.

SHAUL, or **SAUL**, son of Simeon, and grandson of Jacob, Numb. xxvi. 13.

SHAVSHA, one of King David's secretaries, 1 Chron. xviii. 16.

SHEAL, or **SAAL**, son of Bani, dismissed his foreign wife, Ezra x. 29.

SHEARIAH, son of Azel, of the family of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 38; ix. 44.

SHEBA, son of Ramah, Gen. x. 27.

SHEBA, son of Joktan, Gen. x. 28.

SHEBA, son of Joksan, Gen. xxv. 3.

SHEBA, son of Abihail, of the tribe of Gad, resided in Bashan, 1 Chron. v. 13.

SHEBA, son of Bichri, of Benjamin, a turbulent person, who, after the defeat of Absalom, nearly involved Israel in a civil war, 2 Sam. xx. 1, &c. He was killed by a woman at Abel-beth-Maachah, whither he had retired, and was besieged by Joab.

SHEBANIAH, a priest in the time of David, 1 Chron. xv. 24.

SHEBANIAH, a principal Jew, Neh. x. 4.

SHEBUAH, secretary to King Hezekiah, was one of those sent to hear the proposal of Rabshakeh, 2 Kings xviii. 18.

SHEBUEL, eldest son of Gershon, 1 Chron. xxiii. 16; xxvi. 24.

SHECANIAH, son of Arah, under Nehemiah (vi. 18).

SHECANIAH, son of Obadiah, of the royal family of Judah, 1 Chron. iii. 21.

SHECANIAH, a priest, head of the tenth family of the priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 11; Ezra viii. 3, 5.

SHECHEM, son of Hamor, prince of the Shechemites, seduced Dinah, Jacob's daughter, Gen. xxxiv.

SHECHEM, son of Gilead, and chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 31.

SHEDEUR, father of Elizur, of Reuben, Numb. i. 5.

SHEHARIAH, son of Jeroham, of the family of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 26.

SHELAH, son of Judah by Tamar, Gen. xxxviii. 11.

SHELEMAH, a Jew who divorced his foreign wife, Ezra x. 41.

SHELEMAH, of the race of the priests, was appointed by Nehemiah to inspect the first-fruits and tenths belonging to the Temple, Neh. xiii. 13.

SHELEPH, second son of Joktan, Gen. x. 26.

SHELESH, son of Helem, of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 35.

SHELOHITH, daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan, was mother of the blasphemer who was commanded to be stoned.

SHELOMI, father of Ahihud, of Asher, Numb. xxxiv. 27.

Lev. xxiv. 10, 11.

SHELOMITH, daughter of Zerubabel, prince of Judah, 1 Chron. iii. 19.

SHELOMITH, son of Shimei, a Levite, of the family of Gershon, 1 Chron. xxiii. 9.

SHELOMITH, son of Izhar, a Levite, of the family of Gershon, 1 Chron. xxiii. 18; xxiv. 22.

SHELOMITH, daughter of Rehoboam, king of Judah, and of Maachah, 2 Chron. xi. 26.

SHELOMITH, son of Zichri, a descendant of Eliezer, son of Moses, was keeper of the treasures of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 26.

SHELUMIEL, son of Zurishaddai, prince of Simeon, came out of Egypt at the head of fifty thousand men who carried arms, Numb. i. 6; vii. 36; x. 19.

SHEMA, fourth son of Hebron, and father of Rahan, 1 Chron. ii. 42, 43.

SHEMA, son of Joel, and father of Azaz, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 8.

SHEMAAH, father of Joash, of Benjamin, joined David at Gibeah, 1 Chron. xii. 3.

SHEMAIAH, father of Shimri, of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 37.

SHEMAIAH, son of Joel, of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 4.

SHEMAIAH, a prophet sent to Rehoboam, king of Judah, with a message from Jehovah to forbid his war with the revolted Tribes, 2 Chron. xi. 2.

SHEMAIAH, son of Shecaniah, of the royal family of Judah, 1 Chron. iii. 22.

SHEMAIAH, son of Hasshub, a Levite, 1 Chron. ix. 14.

SHEMAIAH, of the race of Elizaphan, a Levite, officiated in the Temple at the head of two hundred of his brethren, 1 Chron. xv. 8, 11.

SHEMAIAH, son of Galal, and grandson of Jeduthun, 1 Chron. ix. 16.

SHEMAIAH, son of Nathanael, was secretary of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxiv. 6.

SHEMAIAH, son of Obededom, was a Levite and porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 4, 7.

SHEMAIAH, a Levite sent by King Jehoshaphat with others to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 8.

SHEMAIAH, a Levite of the family of Jeduthun in the reign of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxix. 14.

SHEMAIAH, a priest in the same reign, 2 Chron. xxxi. 15.

SHEMAIAH, prince of the Levites in the reign of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv. 9.

SHEMAIAH, a principal Israelite who returned from the Captivity, Ezra viii. 16; x. 21, 31.

SHEMAIAH, son of Delaiah, a false prophet who, corrupted by Sanballat and the other enemies of the Jews, attempted to persuade Nehemiah to retire into the Temple, Neh. vi. 10.

SHEMAIAH, the Nehelamite, a false prophet who lived at Babylon while Jere-

miah was at Jerusalem, and who wrote to Zephaniah, prince of the priests, reproaching him for not seizing Jeremiah, and imprisoning him as an imposter, Jer. xxix. 24, 25-32.

SHEMAIAH, father of Delaiah, a prince of Judah in the reign of Jehoiakim, Jer. xxxvi. 12.

SHEMARIAH, a valiant man who followed David, 1 Chron. xii. 5.

SHEMARIAH, a Jew who divorced his foreign wife, Ezra x. 32.

SHEMEBER, king of Zebouim, one of the five kings defeated by Chedorlaomer and his allies, Gen. xiv.

SHEMER, the name of the person who sold the mount to Omri, king of Israel, upon which he built the city of Samaria.

SHEMIDA, son of Gilead, of Manasseh, head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 22.

SHEMIRAMOTH, a Levitical porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

SHEMUEL, son of Ammihud, prince of Simeon, Numb. xxxiv. 20.

SHEMUEL, son of Thola, 1 Chron. vii. 2.

SHENAZAR, son of Jeconiah, king of Judah, 1 Chron. iii. 18.

SHEPHATIAH, son of David and Abital, 2 Sam. iii. 4; 1 Chron. iii. 3.

SHEPHATIAH, son of Reuel, and father of Meshullam, 1 Chron. ix. 8.

SHEPHATIAH, a valiant man who joined David at Ziklag, 1 Chron. xii. 5.

SHEPHATIAH, son of Maachah, chief of Simeon in David's time, 1 Chron. xxvii. 16.

SHEPHATIAH, son of King Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xxi. 2.

SHEPHATIAH, son of Halti, Ezra ii. 57; Neh. vii. 9.

SHEPHATIAH, son of Mattan, was one of those who accused Jeremiah of intimidating the people by his doleful prophecies, Jer. xxxviii. 1.

SHEPHI, son of Shobal, of the race of Seir, was an ancient king of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 23; 1 Chron. i. 38.

SHEPHUPHAN, **SEPHUPHAN**, or **SEPHAM**, son of Bela, and grandson of

SHERAH, the daughter of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 24.

SHERESH, son of Peresh and Machir, 1 Chron. vii. 16.

SHESHAN, father of Ahlai, one of David's warriors, 1 Chron. ii. 31.

SHESBAZZAR, is supposed by the majority of interpreters to be the name of Zerubbabel, but some contend that he was a Persian officer sent to govern the Jews.

SHESHEAL, **SESAL**, or **SASAI**, an ancient giant, a son or descendant of Anak, was driven from Hebron by Caleb, son of Jephunneh, Josh. xv. 14.

SHETHAR, a Persian or Median appellative, a principal officer of the court of Ahasuerus, Esther i. 14.

SHETHAR-BOZNAI, also a Persian or Median name, an officer of the king of Persia beyond the Euphrates, who wrote a letter to his sovereign against the Jews, Ezra v. 6.

SHEVA, secretary of King David, 2 Sam. xx. 25.

SHILIH, father of Azubah, the mother of King Jehoshaphat, 1 Kings xxii. 42.

SHILSHAH, son of Zophar, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 37.

SHIMEA, a Levite, son of Michael, and father of Berachiah, 1 Chron. vi. 39.

SHIMEA, son of Uzza, and father of Haggia, a Levite, 1 Chron. vi. 39.

SHIMEA, or **SHAMMUA**, son of David and Bathsheba, 1 Chron. iii. 5.

SHIMEAH, a prince of a family of Benjamin, was son of Mikloth, 1 Chron. viii. 32.

SHIMEAH, brother of David, and father of Jonathan and Jonadab, 2 Sam. xlii. 31.

SHIMEAM, son of Mikloth, 1 Chron. ix. 38.

SHIMEATH, mother of Jozachar, 2 Kings xii. 21.

SHIMEL, and **RZI**, are mentioned, 1 Kings i. 8.

SHIMEL, son of Gog, father of Micah, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. v. 4.

SHIMEL, son of Zachur, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 27.

SHIMEI, son of Libni, 1 Chron. vi. 29.

SHIMEI, of Romanthi, had the charge of David's wine-cellars, 1 Chron. xxvii. 27.

SHIMEI, one of the chief officers placed by Hezekiah over the store-rooms of the Temple built by him, 2 Chron. xxxi. 12.

SHIMI, or **SEMEI**, second son of Gershon, and grandson of Levi, was head of a family, Exod. vi. 17; Numb. iii. 21.

SHIMON, of the race of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

SHIMRATH, son of Shimhi, or Shema, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 21.

SHIMRI, or **SEMRI**, son of Shemaiah, and father of Jedaiah, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 37.

SHIMRITH, mother of Jehozabad, 2 Chron. xxiv. 26.

SHIMRON, son of Issachar, father of the Shimronites, Numb. xxvi. 24; 1 Chron. vii. 1. He is called Shimrom, Gen. xlv. 13.

SHIMSHAI, or **SAMSAI**, a secretary or scribe, who wrote to Artaxerxes, king of Persia, against the Jews, Ezra iv. 8.

SHINAB, or **SEUNAAB**, king of Admah, was one of the kings conquered by Amraphel and his allies, Gen. xiv. 2.

SHIPIH, son of Allon, of the tribe of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 37.

SHIPRAH, or **SEPHORAH**, one of the midwives of Egypt who preserved the Hebrew male infants, notwithstanding the edict of Pharaoh, Exod. i. 15.

SHIPTAN, or **SEPHTAM**, father of Kemuel, of the tribe of Ephraim, Numb. xxxiv. 24.

SHISHA, a secretary of King David, 2 Sam. xx. 25, called Shavsha, 1 Chron. xviii. 16.

SHISHA, father of Ahiah, secretary of King Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 3.

SHITRAI, a Sharonite, superintendent of David's shepherds, 1 Chron. xxvii. 29.

SHIZA, father of Adina, of the tribe of Reuben, 1 Chron. xi. 42.

SHOBAB, son of David and Bathsheba, 2 Sam. v. 14.

SHOBACH, general of the army of Hadadezer, king of Syria, was completely

defeated by David at Helam, 2 Sam. x. 16, 18, &c.

SHOBAL, of the sacerdotal race, returned from the Captivity with Zerubabel, Ezra ii. 42.

SHOBAL, son of Seir, Gen. xxiv. 29.

SHOBAL, son of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 52.

SHOBK, one of the chiefs of Judah who sealed the covenant, Neh. x. 24.

SHOBI, son of Nahash, of the city of Rabbah, went with Barzillai to meet David when he fled from Absalom, 2 Sam. xvii. 27.

SHOHAM, son of Merari, 1 Chron. xxiv. 27.

SHUAH, sixth son of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2.

SHUAH, daughter of Heber, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 32.

SHUAH, daughter of Hirah the Adullamite, and wife of Judah, son of Jacob, Gen. xxxviii. 2.

SHUAH, brother of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 11.

SHUBAEL, son of Amram and father of Jedeiah, 1 Chron. xxiv. 20, was, with his twelve sons, the thirteenth in order of the twenty-four families of the Levites, 1 Chron. xxv. 20.

SHUHAM, or **SUAM**, son of Hushim, and grandson of Dan, head of a family, Gen. xlv. 23; Numb. xxvi. 42.

SHUNI, third son of Gad, and head of a family, Gen. xlv. 16; Numb. xxvi. 15.

SHUPPIM, son of Ir, 1 Chron. vii. 12.

SHUTHELAH, son of Ephraim, and father of Bared, was head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 35.

SIAHA, one of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 44.

SIBBECHAI, or **SOBAICHAH**, of the city of Hushathi, a hero of David's army, killed the giant Saph, 2 Sam. xxi. 8.

SIMEON, son of Jacob and Leah, ancestor of the tribe which bears his name, Gen. xxix. 3.

SIMEON, an Israelite who divorced his foreign wife, Ezra x. 31.

SIMEON, son of Judah, and father of

Levi in our Saviour's genealogy, Luke iii. 30.

SIMEON, a devout old man at Jerusalem, who was in expectation of the redemption of Israel when our Saviour was born. He had been divinely assured that before his death he would see Christ the Lord, and he came, prompted by inspiration, into the Temple, at the time when Joseph and Mary were presenting our Saviour in obedience to the Law. Simeon took the divine infant in his arms, and expressed himself in the language of the beautiful song, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." It is believed that he died soon after giving this testimony. There are various traditions concerning Simeon, and his tomb was anciently pointed out in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. It is also alleged that he is the same as Simeon the Just, the son of Hillel, and the master of Gamaliel, St Paul's preceptor.

SIMEON, or **SIMON**, was son of Cleophas and of the sister of the Virgin Mary, also called Mary. He is probably the same as Simon mentioned by St Mark (vi. 3), and there can be little doubt that he was one of the earliest disciples of our Saviour. Epiphanius relates that when the Jews murdered St James called *the Less*, his brother Simeon reproached them for their cruelty. Eusebius relates several particulars of Simeon's history, as believed by the early Church, and informs us that he was crucified, after enduring great tortures, about A.D. 107, in the hundred and twentieth year of his age.

SIMON, a name of St Peter.

SIMON, called the *Pharisee*, entertained our Saviour after he had raised the child of the widow of Nain, Luke vii. 36, &c. While Christ was at table with Simon, a woman noted for her licentious life entered the apartment, poured perfume on his feet, and, washing

them with her tears, wiped them with her flowing hair. Simon was astonished and dissatisfied at this conduct, but he was reproved by our Saviour, who forgave the repentant sinner, while he condemned by a forcible similitude the unforgiving Pharisee.

SIMON, called *the Leper*, resided at Bethany, near Jerusalem, Matt. xxvi. 6; Mark xiv. 3; John xi. 12. A few days before his Passion, our Saviour was invited by Simon the Leper to eat with him. Lazarus, who had been raised from the dead, was present: his sister Martha was busily engaged in attending them, and his other sister Mary, to show her love and respect for her Lord, brought a box of perfumes, which she poured on his feet. This transaction was different from that which took place two years before in the house of Simon the Pharisee, and Mary, the sister of Lazarus, must not be identified with the repentant woman of Nain.

SIMON, father of Judas Iscariot, of whom nothing is known, John vi. 71.

SIMON, called *Niger*, or *the Black*, was among the teachers of the Church at Antioch, and was one of those who set apart St Paul and St Barnabas for their mission to the Gentiles, Acts xiii. 1.

SIMON, called *the Tanner*, hospitably entertained and lodged St Peter several days in his house at Joppa, and it was there the messenger from Cornelius the centurion had an interview with the Apostle, Acts x.

SIMON MAGUS, called *the Sorcerer*, it is said was a native of a village called Gitton in the district of Samaria. When Philip the deacon went to Samaria his discourses converted many persons, whom he baptized, and among them Simon Magus. St John and St Peter afterwards visited that city for the purpose of confirming the baptized converts, and Simon, astonished at the power invested in the two Apostles and its effects, offered money to be possessed of similar authority, but St Peter immediately and sternly exclaimed—"Thy money perish with thee—thou art in the gall of bitterness,

and in the bond of iniquity." Simon answered—"Pray ye to the Lord for me," &c. St Luke adds that Simon had addicted himself to magic before the appearance of St Philip in Samaria, and that by his impostures and enchantments he had seduced and perverted the people, who said of him—"This man is the great power of God," Acts viii. 5-13. The ecclesiastical historians relate many particulars and traditions of Simon Magus.

SIMRI, or **SEMRI**, son of Merari, of whom it is stated that though not the first-born, his father made him the chief of his family, 1 Chron. xxvi. 10.

SINITE, or **SINÆUS**, the eighth son of Canaan, Gen. x. 17.

SISAI, a giant of the race of the Anakim, Numb. xiii. 22.

SISAMAI, son of Eleasah, 1 Chron. ii. 40.

SODI, father of Gaddiel, one of the spies sent to search the Promised Land, Numb. xiii. 10.

SOPHER, or **SOPER**, a commander in the army of King Zedekiah, 2 Kings xxv. 19.

SOTAI, an Israelite whose family returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 55; Neh. vii. 57.

SUAII, son of Zophach, 1 Chron. vii. 36.

SUSI, father of Gaddi, of the tribe of Manasseh. Numb. xiii. 11.

T

TABEAL, or **TABEEL**, a person whose son was intended by Rezim, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, to be placed on the throne of Judah, excluding or rather deposing Ahab, Isa. vii. 6.

TABEEL, a person who opposed the re-establishment of the Temple, Ezra iv. 7.

TABITHA, a Christian widow who lived at Joppa, honourably noticed in the Acts of the Apostles for her faith, alms-deeds, and other good works. She died, but was restored to life by St Peter in a remarkable manner, Acts ix.

TABRIMMON, father of Benhadad, king of Syria, 1 Kings xv. 18.

TAHAN, or **TUHEN**, son of Ephraim, head of a family, Numb. xxvi. 35.

TAHAN, or **THAAN**, son of Telah, and father of Laadan, of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 25.

TAHATH, son of Kohath, and father of Uriel, 1 Chron. vi. 24.

TAHATH, son of Bered, and grandson of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 20.

TAHREA, son of Micah, 1 Chron. ix. 41.

TALMAI, or **TUOLMAI**, son of Anah, of the race of the giants, destroyed by

the Israelites, Numb. xiii. 33; Josh. xv. 14.

TALMAI, son of Ammihud, king of Geshur, and father of Maachah, a wife of David, 2 Sam. iii. 3; xiii. 37.

TALMON, a Levitical porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. ix. 17.

TAMAH, father of a family of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon, Neh. vii. 55.

TAMAR, or **THAMAR**, daughter-in-law of Judah, son of the Patriarch Jacob, wife of Er and Ornan, and mother of Pharez and Tarah. The Rabbins relate many ridiculous traditions concerning her.

TAMAR, daughter of Maachah the wife of King David by a former husband, was by courtesy ranked among the king's children, and was the (supposed) sister of Absalom. Her extraordinary beauty was the occasion of her nominal brother Amnon (for he was not literally her brother) falling in love with, dishonouring, hating, and then forcibly expelling her from his house.

TAMAR, a daughter of Absalom so called, 2 Sam. xiv. 27.

TANHUMETH, father of 2 Kings xxv. 23; Jer. xl. 8.

TAPHATH, a daughter of King Solomon who was married to the son of Abinadab, governor of the province of Dor, 1 Kings iv. 11.

TAREAH, son of Micah, and grandson of Jonathan, son of Saul, 1 Chron. viii. 35, compared with 1 Chron. ix. 41.

TARSHISH, or **THARSIS**, second son of Javan, Gen. x. 4.

TARSHISH, a Persian nobleman so called, Esther i. 4.

TARTAN, an officer of King Sennacherib, sent with a message to Hezekiah, king of Judah, 2 Kings xviii. 17.

TATNAI, an officer of the king of Persia, was governor of Samaria. He opposed the rebuilding of Jerusalem, Ezra v. 6.

TEBAH, son of Nahor and his concubine Reumah, Gen. xxii. 24.

TEBALIAH, a porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 11.

TEHINNAH, son of Esthon, of the family of Caleb, and father of the family of Nahash, or Ir-Nahash, 1 Chron. iv. 12.

TELAH, son of Resheph, of Ephraim, father of Tahan, 1 Chron. vii. 25.

TEMA, or **THEMA**, son of Ishmael, Gen. xxv. 15.

TEMAN, or **THEMAN**, son of Eliphaz, and grandson of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 15.

TEMANI, from the name **TEMAN**, son of Asher and of Naarah, 1 Chron. iv. 6.

TERAH, son of Nahor, and father of Abraham, died at Haran in Mesopotamia, Gen. xi. 31, 32. The Orientals relate some curious traditions of him.

THAHASH, third son of Nahor and Reumah, Gen. xxii. 24.

THAMAH, one of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 53; Neh. vii. 55.

THARSHISH, or **THARSIS**, son of Bilhan, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

TIDAL, called *King of Nations*, Gen. xiv. 1.

TILON, son of Shimon, a descendant of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

TIMNA, son of Eliphaz, and grandson of Esau, 1 Chron. i. 36.

TIMNA, concubine of Esau, and mother of Amalek, Gen. xxxvi. 11.

TIMNA, one of the ancient dukes of Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 40; 1 Chron. i. 51.

TIMON, one of the seven Apostolical Deacons, of whom nothing is known, Acts vi. 5.

TIRAS, seventh son of Japheth, Gen. x. 2.

TIRIA, son of Jehaleel, a descendant of Caleb, 1 Chron. iv. 16.

TIRZAH, fifth daughter of Zelophehad, Numb. xxvi. 33; xxvii. 1; Josh. xvii. 3.

TITUS, also called **JUSTUS**, a native of Corinth, with whom St Paul lodged, Acts xvii. 7.

TOB-ADONIAH, a Levite sent with others by King Jehoshaphat to the cities of Judah to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 8.

TOBIAH, son of Nekedab, whose family returned from the Captivity, Ezra ii. 60.

TOBIJAH, a Levite sent by Jehoshaphat to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 8.

TOGARMAH, the third son of Gomer, Gen. x. 3.

TOHU, son of Zuph, or Suph, father of Elihu, 1 Sam. i. 1; 1 Chron. vi. 34.

TOI, an ancient king of Hamath in the time of David, 2 Sam. viii. 9-11.

TOLA, eldest son of Issachar, and chief of a family, Gen. xlvi. 13; Numb. xxvii. 23.

TUBAL, fifth son of Japheth, Gen. x. 2.

U

ULLA, of the tribe of Asher, 1 Chron. vii. 39.

ULAM, son of Machir and Maachah, and father of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 16.

ULAM, son of Eshek, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 39.

UNNI, a musician, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

URAI, son of Bela, of the tribe of Benjamin, also called Uzzi, 1 Chron. vii. 7.

URBANE, is mentioned by St Paul as "our helper in Christ," Rom. xvi. 9.

URI, father of Bezaleel, of Judah, Exod. xxi. 2.

URIAH, the Hittite, and husband of Bathsheba, is celebrated by his death and the circumstances which caused it, 2 Sam. xi. 5, 6. The Rabbins set forth a most absurd defence of the conduct of David and Bathsheba.

URIEL, son of Tahash, and father of Uzziab, a Levite, of the family of Kohath, 1 Chron. vi. 24; xv. 5, 11.

URIEL, of Gibeah, the maternal grandfather of King Abijah, 2 Chron. xiii. 2.

URIJAH, chief priest of the Jews in the reign of Ahaz, king of Judah. He obeyed this idolatrous prince in all his commands, 2 Kings xvi. 10-12.

URIJAH, a prophet, son of Shemaiah, of Kirjath-jearim, Jer. xxvi. 20, 21.

UTHAI, son of Ammihud, of Judah, 1 Chron. ix. 4.

UZ, the eldest son of Aram, and grandson of Shem.

UZAI, father of Palai, Neh. iii. 25.

UZAL, sixth son of Joktan, Gen. x. 27; 1 Chron. i. 21.

UZZAH, son of Abinidab, a Levite, who with his brother Ahio was struck dead for touching the ark, 2 Sam. vi.

UZZI, son of Bukki, was the predecessor of Eli in the high priesthood.

UZZIAH, son of Uriel, of the family of Kohath, 1 Chron. vi. 24.

UZZIEL, son of Kohath, a Levite, and chief of a family, Numb. iii. 27.

V

VAJEZATHA, a Persian appellative, the youngest son of Haman, Esther ix. 9.

VANIAH, one who put away his idolatrous wife after the return from the Captivity, Ezra x. 36.

Z

ZAAVAN, an ancient duke of Edom, Gen. xxxvii. 27; 1 Chron. i. 42.

ZABAD, son of Nathan, and father of Ophai, of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 36, 37.

ZABAD, son of Tahath, and father of Shuthelah, of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 21.

ZABAD, son of Shimeath, an Ammonitess. He conspired with Jehozabad against Joash, king of Judah, and murdered him, 2 Chron. xxiv. 26.

ZABAD, an Israelite who divorced his foreign wife, Ezra x. 27.

ZABBAL, son of Bebai, separated from his wife, Ezra x. 28.

ZABDI, or **ZABDIAS**, son of Zerab, and grandfather of Achan, Josh. vii. 1.

ZABDI, a keeper of King David's wine-cellars, 1 Chron. xxvii. 27.

ZABDIEL, father of Jashobeam, commanded 24,000 men who served in the first month as the life-guards of David, 1 Chron. xxvii. 2.

ZABINA, an Israelite who separated from his foreign wife, Ezra x. 43.

ZABUD, son of Nathan, was a favourite of King Solomon, 1 Kings iv. 5.

ZACCAI, a person whose family and dependants, in number seven hundred

and sixty, returned from Babylon, Ezra ii. 9.

ZACCHUR, father of Shammua, of the tribe of Reuben, Numb. xiii. 4.

ZACCHUR, son of Hamuel, was father of Shimei, 1 Chron. iv. 26.

ZACCHUR, a Levite of the family of Merari, 1 Chron. xxiv. 27.

ZACCHUR, a Levite and singer, son of Asaph, 1 Chron. xxv. 2.

ZACCHUR, son of Bigvai, returned from the Captivity, Ezra viii. 14; Neh. iii. 2.

ZACHARIAH, of the tribe of Reuben, was head of a family, 1 Chron. v. 7.

ZACHARIAH, son of Meshelemiah, a porter of the Temple, of the family of Korah, 1 Chron. ix. 21.

ZACHARIAH, a Levite, one of those sent by King Jehoshaphat throughout Judah to instruct the people, 2 Chron. xvii. 7.

ZACHARIAH, son of Berachiah, or Jeherechiah, Isa. viii. 2.

ZACHARIAH, father of Abi, or Abijah, mother of King Hezekiah, 2 Kings xviii. 2; 2 Chron. xxix. 1.

ZACHARIAH, a Levite of the family of Asaph, 2 Chron. xxix. 13.

ZACHER, son of Gibeon and Maachah, 1 Chron. viii. 31.

ZADOK, son of Ahitub, was father of Shallum, high priest in the reign of Jotham, king of Judah.

ZAHAM, son of Rehoboam and of Abihail, the daughter of Eliab, 2 Chron. xi. 19.

ZALAPH, father of Hanun, Neh. iii. 30.

ZALMUNNA, prince of the Midianites, defeated by Gideon, Judges viii. 5.

ZARA, son of Judah and Tamar, Gen. xxxviii. 28, 29.

ZATTHU, an Israelite who renewed the covenant, Neh. x. 14.

ZATTU, probably the same as Zathu, returned from Babylon with nine hundred and forty persons of his family and dependants, Ezra ii. 8.

ZAZA, son of Jonathan, of the family of Jerahmeel, son of Hezron, of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 33.

ZEBADIAH, son of Beriah, 1 Chron. viii. 15.

ZEBADIAH, son of Elpaal, 1 Chron. viii. 16, 17.

ZEBADIAH, son of Jehoram, of Gedor, adhered to David when persecuted by Saul, 1 Chron. xii. 7.

ZEBADIAH, a Levite, son of Meshelemiah, a porter of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxvi. 2.

ZEBADIAH, son of Michael, returned from the Captivity at the head of eighty persons, Ezra viii. 8.

ZEBAH, a prince of the Midianites, slain by Gideon, Judges viii. 5, 21; Psalm lxxxiii. 11.

ZEBEDEE, son of Asaph, and father of Micah, was a musician of the Temple, Neh. xi. 17.

ZEBEDEE, father of St James and St John the Evangelist, Matt. iv. 21. Nothing authentic is known of him, except that he was a fisherman by profession, and that his wife was named Salome.

ZEBUDAH, mother of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, 2 Kings xxiii. 36.

ZEBUL, governor of Shechem for Abimelech, son of Gideon, Judges ix. 28.

ZEBULUN, the sixth son of Jacob and Leah, was ancestor of the tribe which bears his name, Gen. xxx. 20.

ZECHARIAH. See **ZACHARIAH**.

ZEDEKIAH, second son of King Jehoiakim, 1 Chron. iii. 16.

ZEDEKIAH, son of Chenaanah, a false prophet of Samaria in the reign of Ahab, 1 Kings xxii. 11.

ZEDEKIAH, son of Maaseiah, a false prophet who always opposed Jeremiah (xxix. 21, 22).

ZELEK, or **SELEK**, an Ammonite, one of David's heroes, 2 Sam. xxiii. 37; 1 Chron. xi. 39.

ZELOPHEHAD, son of Hephher, of the tribe of Manasseh. As he left no male offspring his five daughters received his portion in the Land of Canaan. Numb. xxvi. 33; xxvii. 1.

ZEMAR, son of Bochar, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 8.

ZENAS, a doctor of the Law, and disciple of St Paul, Titus iii. 13.

ZEPHANIAH, son of Maaseiah, called the second high priest, while the high priest Seraiah performed the functions of his office, 2 Kings xxv. 18. He was put to death at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar.

ZEPHANIAH, a Levite, of the family of Kohath, 1 Chron. vi. 36.

ZEPHI, or **ZEPHO**, third son of Eliphaz, son of Esau, 1 Chron. i. 36.

ZEPHON, son of Gad, was chief of a family, Numb. xxvi. 15.

ZERA, or **ZARA**, of Bozrah, son of Reuel, was grandson of Esau, and father of Jobab, Numb. xxvi. 13.

ZERA, son of Simeon, and grandson of Jacob, was father of a family, Numb. xxvi. 13.

ZERAH, king of the Cushite-Ethiopia in Arabia Petraea on the Red Sea, was miraculously defeated in the Valley of Zephathah, near Mareshah, and was pursued by Asa, king of Judah, 2 Chron. xiv. 9, &c.

ZERAIHIAH, son of the high priest Uzzi, was father of Meraioth, 1 Chron. vi. 6.

ZERESII, the wife of Haman, advised the destruction of Mordecai, Esther v. 10, 14.

ZERETH, son of Asher, 1 Chron. iv. 7.

ZERI, son of Jeduthun, whose family was the fourth of the twenty-four Levitical families attending in the Temple.

ZEROR, son of Bechor, an ancestor of King Saul, 1 Sam. ix. 1.

ZERUAH, mother of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xi. 26.

ZERUAIAH, sister of David, and mother of Joab, Abishai, and Asabel, 2 Sam. ii. 18; 1 Chron. ii. 11.

ZETHAN, or **ZETHAM**, son of Bilnan, of the tribe of Benjamin, 1 Chron. vii. 10.

ZETHAN, son of Laadan, of Levi, and of the family of Gershon, was a treasurer of the Temple, 1 Chron. xxiii. 8; xxvi. 22.

ZETHAR, a Persian appellative, one

of the principal officers of Ahasuerus, Esther i. 10.

ZIA, son of Abihail, of the tribe of Gad, 1 Chron. v. 13.

ZIA, son of Hasupha, one of the Nethinim, Ezra ii. 43.

ZIBA, a servant of King Saul, 2 Sam. ix. See SAUL.

ZIBEON, a Hivite, father of Anah, and grandfather of Abolibamah, the wife of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 2; 1 Chron. i. 38.

ZIBIAH, of Sebia, of Beersheba, mother of King Jehoash, 2 Kings xii. 1.

ZIBIAH, son of Hodesh, 1 Chron. viii. 9.

ZICHRI, or **ZECHRI**, son of Izhar, and grandson of Kohath, Exod. vi. 21.

ZICHRI, of Ephraim, a warlike man, who killed Maaseiah, son of King Ahaz, Arikam, governor of the palace, and Elkanah, 2 Chron. xxviii. 7.

ZILLAH, one of the two wives of Lamech, was mother of Tubal-Cain and Naamah, Gen. iv. 21, 22.

ZILPAH, Leah's handmaid, was mother of Gad and Asher, Gen. xxx. 9; xlv. 18.

ZILTHAI, a Benjamite, one of David's captains, 1 Chron. viii. 21; xii. 20.

ZIMMAH, a Levite, father of Joash, of the family of Gershon, 2 Chron. xxix. 12.

ZIMRAM, the eldest son of Abraham by Keturah, Gen. xxv. 2.

ZIMRI, son of Zerah, and grandson of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 6.

ZIMRI, son of Salu, prince of the tribe of Simeon, was slain by Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the high priest, in the tent of a Midianitish woman, Numb. xxv. 14.

ZINA, the son of Shimei, a Levite, 1 Chron. xxiii. 10.

ZING, or **ZENJ**, son of Ham.

ZIPH, or **ZIPHA**, son of Jehaleleel, of the family of Caleb, and tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 16.

ZIPHION, the eldest son of Gad, Gen. xlv. 16.

ZIPPORAH, the wife of Moses. See MOSES.

ZITHRI, son of Umziel, Exod. vi. 22.

ZIZA, son of Shippi, 1 Chron. iv. 37.

ZIZA, son of King Rehoboam, 2 Chron. xi. 20.

ZOBEHAH, son of Coz, 1 Chron. iv. 8.

ZOHAR, son of Ephron the Hittite, Gen. xxiii. 8.

ZOHAR, fifth son of Simeon, Gen. xlv. 10.

ZOETH, son of Ishi, of Simeon, 1 Chron. iv. 20.

ZOPHAH, or **SUPHA**, son of Helem, of the tribe of Ashur, 1 Chron. vii. 35, 36.

ZOPHAL, son of Elkanah, of the family of Kohath, 1 Chron. vi. 26.

ZOPHAR, the Naamathite, one of Job's friends. Job ii. 11.

ZUAR, father of Nathanael, of Issachar, Numb. i. 8.

ZUPH, a Levite, head of the family called the Zuphim, was great-grandfather of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 1; 1 Chron. vi. 36.

ZUR, or **SUR**, a prince of Midian, was killed by Phinehas, Numb. xxv. 15.

ZUR, of Jehiel and Maachah, of Benjamin, 1 Chron. viii. 30; xi. 36.

ZURIEL, son of Abihail, chief of the families of the Mahlites and the Mushites, Numb. iii. 33, 35.

ZURISHADDAI, father of Shelumiel, chief of the tribe of Simeon at the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, Numb. i. 6.

SUCCESSION OF THE JEWISH HIGH PRIESTS ACCORDING TO INSPIRED WRITINGS.

THE Succession of these ancient Pontiffs of the Chosen People is variously stated in the Scriptures, in the Works of Josephus, and in the Jewish Chronicle. The following list is in some respects at variance with that given in the First Book of the Chronicles (vi. 3-15), but there is every probability, in conformity to the customs of the East, that the same persons are indicated, though mentioned by different names.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. AARON. | 15. Johanán. |
| 2. Eleazar. | 16. Azariah. |
| 3. Abiezer, or Abishua. | 17. Amariah. |
| 4. Phinehas. | 18. Ahitub II. |
| 5. Bukki. | 19. Zadok II. |
| 6. Uzzi. | 20. Uriah. |
| 7. Eli. | 21. Shallum. |
| 8. Ahitub I. | 22. Azariah. |
| 9. Ahiah. | 23. Hilkiah. |
| 10. Abimelech, or Abiathar. | 24. Eliakim, or Joakim. |
| 11. Abiathar, or Abimelech. | 25. Azariah. |
| 12. Zadok I. | 26. Seraiah. |
| 13. Ahimaaz. | 27. Jehozadak. |
| 14. Azariah. | 28. Joshua, or Jesus. |

Continuation collected from Ezra, Nehemiah, and Josephus :—

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 29. Joachim. | 50. Aristobulus, also King of the Jews. |
| 30. Elisib, Joasib, or Chasib. | 51. Alexander Jannæus, also King. |
| 31. Joiada, or Juda. | 52. Hyrcanus. |
| 32. Jonathan, or John. | 53. Aristobulus, an usurper. |
| 33. Jaddus, or Jeddua. | 54. Antigonus, his son, also an usurper. |
| 34. Onias I. | 55. Ananeel. |
| 35. Simon I. the Just. | 56. Aristobulus. |
| 36. Eleazar. | 57. Jesus, son of Phiabis. |
| 37. Manassch. | 58. Simon. |
| 38. Onias II. | 59. Matthias. |
| 39. Simon II. | 60. Joazar. |
| 40. Onias III. | 61. Eleazar. |
| 41. Jesus, or Jason. | 62. Jesus, son of Siah. |
| 42. Onias IV., otherwise Menelaus. | 63. Ananus. |
| 43. Lysimachus. | 64. Ishmael. |
| 44. Alcimus, Jacimus, or Joachim. | 65. Eleazar. |
| 45. Onias V. | 66. Simon. |
| 46. Judas Maccabæus. | 67. Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas. |
| 47. Jonathan Maccabæus. | 68. Jonathan. |
| 48. Simon Maccabæus. | 69. Theophilus. |
| 49. John Hyrcanus. | 70. Simon. |

CAPTURE BIOGRAPHY.

78. Jesus, son of Gamaliel.

79. Matthias.

80. Phannias, A. D. 70, the year of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, when the succession of the Jewish high priesthood became for ever extinct.

of Ananus.

CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF THE HEBREW PROPHETS.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Hosea, under Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah.</p> <p>2. Amos, under Uzziah.</p> <p>3. Isaiah, at the death of Uzziah.</p> <p>4. Jonah.</p> <p>5. Micah.</p> <p>6. Nahum.</p> <p>7. Jeremiah.</p> <p>8. Zephaniah</p> | <p>9. Joel.</p> <p>10. Daniel.</p> <p>11. Ezekiel.</p> <p>12. Habakkuk.</p> <p>13. Obadiah.</p> <p>14. Haggai.</p> <p>15. Zechariah.</p> <p>16. Malachi.</p> |
|---|--|

Besides these there are many Prophets whose names and actions are mentioned by the inspired writers, but of whom nothing is known. After Malachi there were no Prophets in Israel; and we find in the First Book of the Maccabees (iv. 46), that when the altar of burnt-sacrifices was demolished, which had been profaned by the Gentiles, the stones were set aside till a Prophet should appear to declare what should be done with them. A Prophet *did* appear in "the fulness of time," who was also the long-promised Messiah—our LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, the second Person in the glorious Trinity, in whose most blessed name we conclude this Work, begun with His Life as it is recorded by the Inspired Evangelists.

THE END.

